



÷.

MICROCOPY RESOLUTION TEST CHART NATIONAL BUREAU OF STANDARDS-1963-A



REPORT DOCUMENTATION P	AGE	READ INSTRUCTIONS BEFORE COMPLETING FORM
REPORT NUMBER 2	GOVT ACCESSION NO.	3. RECIPIENT'S CATALOG NUMBER
	7155 643	
TITLE (and Subtitle)		5. TYPE OF REPORT & PERIOD COVERED
Minicomputers and Naval Mobi	ile	Master's Thesis:
Construction Battalion Produ	activity	December 1984
		S. PERFORMING ONG. ALFORT ROMBER
AUTHOR(a)		8. CONTRACT OR GRANT NUMBER(*)
Gary R. Wegener		
`		
PERFORMING ORGANIZATION NAME AND ADDRESS		10. PROGRAM ELEMENT, PROJECT, TASK AREA & WORK UNIT NUMBERS
Naval Postgraduate School		
Monterey, California 93943		
. CONTROLLING OFFICE NAME AND ADDRESS		12. REPORT DATE
Naval Postgraduate School		December 1984
Monterey, California 93943		13. NUMBER OF PAGES
MONITORING AGENCY NAME & ADDRESS(II different I	rom Controlling Office)	15. SECURITY CLASS. (of this report)
		ISA DECLASSIFICATION DOWN GRADING
		SCHEDULE
DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT (of this Report)		
Approved for public release:	. diataibutia	- · · · ·
	; arstributic	on unlimited.
••••••	; distributio	on unlimited.
	; distributio	on unlimited.
. DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT (of the ebetract entered in	Block 20, 11 dillerent fro	Accession Bar
. DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT (of the obstract entered in	Block 20, If different fro	Accession Ber Report NTIS GRAAI
. DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT (of the obstract entered in	Block 20, 11 different fro	Recognic for the second
DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT (of the obstract entered in	Block 20, Il dillerent fro	Accession Pap Reform NTIS GRAAI DTIC TAB Unannounced Justification
DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT (of the obstract entered in supplementary notes	Block 20, If different fro	Accession Far Reform TIS GRAAI DTIC TAB Unannounced Justification
DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT (of the ebetrect entered in both statement for the statement in supplementary notes	Block 20, 11 dillorent fro	Accession Pap Reform TIS GRAMI DTIC TAB Unannounced Justification
DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT (of the obstract entered in supplementary notes	Block 20, if different fro	Accession Per MTIS GRAAI DTIC TAB Unannounced Justification By Distribution/
DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT (of the obstract entered in supplementary notes	Block 20, If different fro	Accession Far Ref MTIS GRAAI DTIC TAB Unannounced Justification Distribution/ Availability Codes
DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT (of the obstract entered in SUPPLEMENTARY NOTES	Block 20, if different fro	Accession Bap Report TIS GRA&I DTIC TAB Unannounced Justification Distribution/ Availability Codes Avail and/or
. DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT (of the obstract entered in SUPPLEMENTARY NOTES . KEY WORDS (Continue on reverse elde if necessary and Minicomputer	Block 20, Il different fro DT COU INSPEL 1 Identify by block number;	Accession Ber NTIS GRAAI DTIC TAB Unannounced Justification Distribution/ Availability Codes Avail and/or Dist. Special
DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT (of the observed in SUPPLEMENTARY NOTES KEY WORDS (Continue on reverse elde if necessary and Minicomputer Productivity	Block 20, if different fro	Accession Bar MIIS GRAAI DTIC TAB Unannounced Justification Distribution/ Availability Codes Avail end/or Dist Special
DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT (of the ebetrect entered in SUPPLEMENTARY NOTES KEY WORDS (Continue on reverse elde if necessary and Minicomputer Productivity Naval Mobile Construction Ba	Block 20, if different fro	Accession Far Accession Far NTIS GRAAI DTIC TAB Unannounced Justification Distribution/ Availability Codes Availability Codes Availability Special
DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT (of the obstract entered in SUPPLEMENTARY NOTES KEY WORDS (Continue on reverse elde if necessary and Minicomputer Productivity Naval Mobile Construction Ba	Block 20, Il different fro	Accession Ber NTIS GRAAI DTIC TAB Unannounced Justification Distribution/ Availability Codes Avail and/or Dist Special
DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT (of the ebetrect entered in     SUPPLEMENTARY NOTES      KEY WORDS (Continue on reverse elde II necessary and     Minicomputer     Productivity     Naval Mobile Construction Ba	Block 20, If different fro DT COUNSPER Identify by block number; attalion	Accession Bar NTIS GRAAI DTIC TAB Unannounced Justification Distribution/ Availability Codes Avail and/or Dist Special
<ul> <li>DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT (of the ebetrect entered in</li> <li>SUPPLEMENTARY NOTES</li> <li>KEY WORDS (Continue on reverse elde if necessary and Minicomputer Productivity Naval Mobile Construction Based</li> <li>ABSTRACT (Continue on reverse elde if necessary and in In 1978-79 minicomputers to</li> </ul>	Block 20, if different fro DT UNSPER Identify by block number; attalion	Accession Far Accession Far NTIS GRAAI DTIC TAB Unannounced Justification Distribution/ Availability Codes Availability Codes Availability Codes Availability Codes
<ul> <li>DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT (of the observed in observed in supplementary notes</li> <li>SUPPLEMENTARY NOTES</li> <li>KEY WORDS (Continue on reverse olde if necessary and Minicomputer Productivity Naval Mobile Construction Batalio)</li> <li>ABSTRACT (Continue on reverse olde If necessary and i In 1978-79, minicomputers we Mobile Construction Battalio)</li> </ul>	Block 20, if different fro	Accession Far Accession Far NTIS GRAAI DTIC TAB Unannounced Justification C Distribution/ Availability Codes Availability Codes Availability Codes Availability Special
<ul> <li>DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT (of the observed in observed in observed in supplementary notes</li> <li>SUPPLEMENTARY NOTES</li> <li>KEY WORDS (Continue on reverse olde II necessary and Minicomputer Productivity Naval Mobile Construction Batalic In 1978-79, minicomputers we Mobile Construction Battalic upon a study that projected</li> </ul>	Block 20, If different fro DT COT Identify by block number; attalion dentify by block number; ere installed on mainbody of increased DT	Accession Bap MIIS GRAAI DTIC TAB Unannounced Justification Distribution/ Availability Codes Avail and/or Dist Special d at the five U. S. Nava deployment sites, based roductivity. This thesi
<ul> <li>DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT (of the observed ontered in</li> <li>SUPPLEMENTARY NOTES</li> <li>KEY WORDS (Continue on reverse olde II necessary and Minicomputer Productivity Naval Mobile Construction Batalia In 1978-79, minicomputers we Mobile Construction Battalia upon a study that projected examines the issue of produce</li> </ul>	Block 20, If different fro Diock 20, If different fro UNSPECTION Identify by block number; attalion dentify by block number; are installed on mainbody of increased pr ctivity in co	Accession Bap MIIS GRAAI DTIC TAB Unannounced Justification Distribution/ Availability Codes Avail end/or Dist Special d at the five U. S. Nava deployment sites, based coductivity. This thesi onstruction battalions.
<ul> <li>DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT (of the ebetrect entered in</li> <li>SUPPLEMENTARY NOTES</li> <li>KEY WORDS (Continue on reverse elde if necessary and Minicomputer Productivity Naval Mobile Construction Batalia In 1978-79, minicomputers wa Mobile Construction Battalia upon a study that projected examines the issue of produc It developes and tests a production</li> </ul>	Block 20, If different fro	Accession Bar Accession Bar NTIS GRAAI DTIC TAB Unannounced Justification Distribution/ Availability Codes Availability Codes Availabilit
<ul> <li>DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT (of the ebetrect entered in</li> <li>SUPPLEMENTARY NOTES</li> <li>KEY WORDS (Continue on reverse elde if necessary end Minicomputer Productivity Naval Mobile Construction Batalia In 1978-79, minicomputers we Mobile Construction Battalia upon a study that projected examines the issue of produc It developes and tests a pro- tests a level of effort ind:</li> </ul>	Block 20, if different fro	Accession Far Accession Far NTIS GRAAI DTIC TAB Unannounced Justification Distribution/ Availability Codes Availability Codes Availabilit
DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT (of the observed in SUPPLEMENTARY NOTES KEY WORDS (Continue on reverse elde if necessary and Minicomputer Productivity Naval Mobile Construction Ba ABSTRACT (Continue on reverse elde II necessary and I In 1978-79, minicomputers we Mobile Construction Battalia upon a study that projected examines the issue of produc It developes and tests a pro- tests a level of effort ind: the introduction of the mini-	Block 20, 11 different fro DT COU INSPEC 1 Identify by block number; attalion dentify by block number; ere installed on mainbody of increased pr ctivity in co oductivity ir icator for ch icomputers.	Accession Far Accession Far NTIS GRAAI DTIC TAB Unannounced Justification C Distribution/ Availability Codes Availability Codes Availabi
DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT (of the observed in SUPPLEMENTARY NOTES KEY WORDS (Continue on reverse elde II necessary and Minicomputer Productivity Naval Mobile Construction Ba ABSTRACT (Continue on reverse elde II necessary and I In 1978-79, minicomputers we Mobile Construction Battalia upon a study that projected examines the issue of produc It developes and tests a pro- tests a level of effort ind: the introduction of the mini-	Block 20, If different fro	Accession Bap MTIS GRAAI DTIC TAB Unannounced Justification Distribution/ Availability Codes Avail and/or Dist Special d at the five U. S. Nava deployment sites, based roductivity. This thesi onstruction battalions. ndex, and examines and hanges coincident with
DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT (of the observed in SUPPLEMENTARY NOTES KEY WORDS (Continue on reverse aldo if necessary and Minicomputer Productivity Naval Mobile Construction Ba ABSTRACT (Continue on reverse aldo if necessary and i In 1978-79, minicomputers we Mobile Construction Battalic upon a study that projected examines the issue of produc It developes and tests a pro- tests a level of effort ind: the introduction of the mini- Proam 1473 EDITION OF 1 NOV 65 IS OBSOLE S(N 0102-15-014-6401	Block 20, If different fro DT CON NSPER 1 Identify by block number; attalion dentify by block number; ere installed on mainbody of increased pr ctivity in co oductivity in co oductivity in co oductivity in co oductivity in co oductivity in co	Accession Bar NTIS GRAAI DTIC TAB Unannounced Justification Distribution/ Availability Codes Availability Codes Availabili
2. DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT (of the observed in observed in supplementary notes 3. SUPPLEMENTARY NOTES 3. SUPPLEMENTARY NOTES 3. AUDITOR OF INCOMENTIAL INFORMATION OF THE STATE OF THE SUPPLEMENTARY NOTES 3. AUDITED TO A STUDY OF THE SUPPLEMENTARY NOTES 3. AUDITED TO A STUDY OF THE SUPPLEMENTARY AND THE SUPPLEMENTARY NOTES 3. AUDITED TO A STUDY OF THE SUPPLEMENTARY AND THE SUPPLEMENTARY AND THE SUPPLEMENTARY AND THE SUPPLEMENTARY NOTES 3. AUDITED TO A STUDY OF THE SUPPLEMENTARY AND	Block 20, If different fro DT CON NSPER 1 Identify by block number; attalion dentify by block number; ere installed on mainbody of increased pr ctivity in co oductivity in co	Accession Far Accession Far NTIS GRAAI DTIC TAB Unannounced Justification Distribution/ Availability Codes Availability Codes Availabilit

.

.

Unclassified SECURITY CLASSIFICATION OF THIS PAGE (Then Date Entered)

The productivity index shows no significant differences before and after the introduction of the minicomputers. This is judged to be inconclusive however, because of the assumptions necessary in development of the index. The level of effort indicator does show a statistically significant difference.

The lack of a commonly accepted productivity index for use with in the Naval Construction Force is viewed with concern; recommendations are made for the development of an objective index against which performance may be measured.

5/N 0102- LF- 014- 6601

Approved for public release; distribution is unlimited.

Minicomputers and Naval Mobile Construction Battalion Productivity

by

Gary R. Wegener Lieutenant Commander, Civil Engineer Corps, United States Navy B. S., University of California, Berkeley, 1971

Submitted in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of

MASTER OF SCIENCE IN MANAGEMENT

from the

NAVAI POSTGRADUATE SCHOOL December 1984

Author: ary R. Wegener Approved by: Bodel Advisor D. с. Euske, CO-Advisor WILLIS R. Greer Department of Admi Jr., Chairman, strative Science Rneale T. Marshall, Dean of Information and Policy Sciences

#### ABSTRACT

In 1978-1979, minicomputers were installed at the five U. S. Naval Mobile Construction Battalion mainbody deployment sites, based upon a study that projected increased productivity. This thesis examines the issue of productivity in construction battalions. It develops and tests a productivity index, and examines and tests a level of effort indicator for changes coincident with the introduction of the minicomputers.

The productivity index shows no significant differences before and after the introduction of the minicomputers. This is judged to be inconclusive however, because of the assumptions necessary in development of the index. The level of effort indicator does show a statistically significant difference.

The lack of a commonly accepted productivity index for use within the Naval Construction Force is viewed with concern; recommendations are made for the development of an objective index against which performance may be measured.  $\$ 

52.

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

I.	INTI	RODUCTION
	A.	SCOPE OF THESIS
	в.	PROBLEM STATEMENT
	с.	OBJECTIVE OF THE RESEARCH
	D.	HYPOTHESES
	E.	ACKNOWLEDGEMENT OF THE STUDY'S LIMITATIONS 12
	F.	ORGANIZATION OF THESIS
II.	PROI	DUCTIVITY MEASUREMENT WITHIN THE NMCBS 15
	λ.	U. S. NAVAL MOBILE CONSTRUCTION BATTALIONS
		(NMCBS)
		1. Mission and Composition of the NMCBs 15
		2. Deployment Sites
		3. Construction Tasking
	B.	PRODUCTIVITY
		1. General
		2. The Development cf Productivity
		Measurement
		3. Construction Industry Productivity in
		the Private Sectcr
		4. Productivity in the Naval Mobile
		Construction Battalions
III.	CON	STRUCTION PRODUCTIVITY, ANALYSIS AND
	FIN	DINGS
	A.	CPM AS A PRODUCTIVITY MEASURE
	в.	DATA ELEMENTS USED IN ANALYSIS
		1. Overview
		2. CPM, the Dependent Variable 34

		3.	Inde	e pe	nde	nt	. 7	ar	i	abl	.es	5	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	41
		4.	Init	:ia	1 D	at	a	Re	f	ine	е <b>Д</b> (	en	t	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	43
	с.	CPM	ANAI	YS	IS	A N	D	FI	N		IG:	5	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	49
		1.	Ana]	.ys	is	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	50
		2.	Find	lin	gs	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	53
	D.	CPM	SENS	SIT	IVI	TY.	A	NA	Ľ	YS I	S	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	55
IV.	LEVI	EL OF	? EFI	OR	TA	s	A	PR	0	cua	T	E V I	ITY	I	ND	IC	AT	OR		•	•	•	57
	λ.	INTE	ιορασ	TI	ON						•	•	•		•					_		•	57
	в.	PERC	ENT	DI	REC	T.	LA	BO	R	AS	5	A	PEI	۔ FC FC	RM	AN	CE	!	-	•	•	•	•
	20	MEAS	SURE			-		-	-			•				•				-	•		57
	c.	DAT	ELI	EME	NTS	- : 0	SE	D	ī	י איז	. H :	E .	AN)	- LY	SI	s	-	-	-	-	-		62
		1.	Over	vi	ev		_	-	-			_				-		-	-		-		62
		2.	Depe	en de	ent	- v	ar	ia	Ъ	le.		чB	- AC1	יסו			-			-			64
		3.	Inde	epe	nđe	n t	 : V	ar	i	ab]	les	3					-		-	•	-		64
	D.	PERC	ENT	DI	REC	:T	LA	BO	R	. 1	N	A L'	YS]	S	AN	D	•	-	-	•	•	•	•••
		FINI	INGS	5.		-	•		-				•			•							68
		1.	Anal	VS	is			-	-	-		-							-				68
		2.	Find	lin	as	-	-				-	-	-		-			-	-				74
	E.	PERC	ENT	DI	J- Rec	T	LA	BO	R	SI	EN S	SI	TII	- /IT	Ÿ	- AN	AL	¥S	IS				75
						-									-						-	•	
۷.	CONC	LUSI	ONS	A NI	DR	EC	OM	ME	N I	DAI	I (	) N :	S	٠	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	77
	λ.	COSI	PEI	R W	AND	)A Y	•	•	•	٠	•	•	•	•	•	٠	•	•	•	•	•	•	77
		1.	Conc	:lu	sio	ns	5	•	•	•	٠	•	٠	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	77
		2.	Reco		end	lat	io	ns		•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	78
	Ε.	PERC	ENT	DI	REC	T	LA	во	R	٠	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	78
		1.	Conc	:lu	sio	ns	5	•	•	٠	•	•	•	٠	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	78
		2.	Reco		€⊐đ	lat	io	ns		•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	٠	79
	с.	SUMM	ARY	•	٠	•	•	•	•	٠	•	•	•	•	•	٠	•	•	•	•	•	•	79
APPENDI	IX A:	c c	ONSTR	រោប	TIO	N	PR	OD	U (	CTI	. V :	IT:	YI	) A T	A	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	81
APPENDI	IX B:	T	BULA	TI	CN S	R	EL	AT	I	NG	T	וכ	PRE	LI	MI	NA	RY	С	PM				
		AX	ALYS	SIS	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	86

APPENDI	( C:	PERCENT	DIREC	T	LA	BC	R	DA	TA		•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	. 96
LIST OF	REFEI	RENCES	• • •	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	٠	•	•	100
INITIAL	DIST	RIBUTION	LIST	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	102

. . .

# LIST OF TABLES

7

1.	Introduction of Mini-Computers, by Site 42
2.	Summary Cross-tabulation of 151 CPM Projects 44
3.	Cross-tabulation of 151 CPM Projects, by Type
	and Confidence
4.	Summary Cross-tabulation of 84 Projects 48
5.	Comparison of CPM Means, by Type
6.	Construction Productivity Data
7.	Cross-tabulation of Initial Puerto Rico
	Projects
8.	Cross-tabulation of Initial Projects at Rota,
	Spain
9.	Cross-tabulation of Initial Projects, at Diego
	Garcia
10.	Cross-tabulation of Final Projects at Puerto
	Rico
11.	Cross-tabulation of Final Projects at Rota,
	Spain
12.	Cross-tabulation of Final Projects at Diego
	Garcia
13.	Breakdown of 84 CPM Values by Type, ADP,
	Location
14.	Case Identification for Fercent Direct Labor 96
15.	Percent Direct Labor Data

8

.

....

# LIST OF FIGURES

1.1	Hypothesis I	•	12
1.2	Hypothesis II	•	12
2.1	Estimated Annual Work in Flace by the NCF	•	19
2.2	Productivity, Efficiency, Effectiveness	•	21
3.1	Data Elements Utilized in Analysis of CPM	•	35
3.2	Derivation of CPM Values	•	40
3.3	Official ENR January Material Cost Index	•	41
3.4	ANCVA on 84 CPM values, by Type, Location, and		
	ADP	•	51
3.5	ANOVA USING RECODED FACTORS LOC, TYPE, ADP	•	54
4.1	Tasking Accomplishment	•	59
4.2	Percent Direct Labor/Tasking Completion	•	61
4.3	Conduct	•	64
4_4	Derivation of CCTIBTN	•	ó6
4.5	Weighted Average Turnover Factor	•	63
4.6	ANOVA, WITH ALL LOCATIONS FACTORED SEPERATELY	•	70
4.7	ANCVA For Puerto Rico, Rota, and Guam		
	Deployments	•	71
4.8	ANOVA, for Okinawa Deployments	•	72
4.9	ANOVA, for Diegc Garcia Deployments	•	73
c. 1	NMCB Peacetime Manning Allowance	•	99

#### I. INTRODUCTION

United States Naval Mobile Construction Battalions (NMCBs) are units of the Naval operating forces, responsible for providing responsive military construction support to naval, Marine Corps and other forces in military operations. This has generally taken the form of advance base facilities in direct support of combat personnel.

In 1978-79, minicomputers were installed at each NMCB mainbody site, both deployed and homeport, based on an Automated Data System Development Plan which showed a benefit to cost ratio of twenty-three. Software packages included construction project management, construction equipment management, word processing, and personnel roster maintenance.

The costs have remained close to original estimates through 1982, according to Mr. Berninger of the Civil Engineering Support Office (CESO) in Port Hueneme, California, however the benefits derived from introduction of the minicomputers have been difficult to quantify, leading to doubts as to the viability of the program.

#### SCOPE OF THESIS

This thesis examines available data to determine what productivity related changes, if any, have occurred as a result of the introduction of minicomputers in the NMCBs. The analysis is based primarily on past deployment data contained in deployment completion reports covering a 5 year period from 1977 through 1981, and on project data for 151 projects at three mainbody deployment sites (Camp Cummirs, Diego Garcia; Silver City, Rota, Spain; and Camp Moscript, Puerto Rico).

#### B. PROBLEM STATEMENT

The guestion of interest in this study is whether NMCBs should maintain or expand their organic computer capability, or return to manual, construction management methods.

The addition of a minicomputer capability to the NMCB mainbody sites was projected to increase productivity at each site, resulting in an average 15 percent decrease in construction durations [Ref. 1]. There is concern in the Naval Construction Force (NCF) regarding the wisdom of the original decision. This concern is influenced partly by the difficulty in quantifying the benefits, if any, that have resulted from the computer's introduction, and in particular, how those benefits relate to overall productivity.

A study by Arthur Anderson and Company, the accounting and consulting firm, has projected that "the construction industry is likely to be at the leading edge of growth in the personal computer industry." Reasons cited include the "dynamic nature of the construction industry", the computers' ability to "provide more complete and accurate control over the progress of a job", and the contention that "it also serves as a motivation for engineers and project managers schooled in computer techniques." The study also projected that "new software products to serve the construction industry will continue to appear in a wild profusion." [Ref. 2]

### C. OBJECTIVE OF THE RESEARCH

It is the intent of this research to examine existing project and battalion deployment data and ascertain whether any statistically significant changes which can be related to productivity occurred coincident with introduction of the computers. 

#### D. HYPOTHESES

Two productivity indices are developed, one dealing with the dollar value of construction completed per manday of direct labor, and another dealing with the percentage of direct labor obtained from a relatively fixed labor force, the NMCB. The hypotheses listed below are used to test if these productivity indices have changed with the introduction of the computers.

The dollar cost of material in place per direct labor manday is statistically different for construction projects accomplished since the introduction of minicomputers at the mainbody sites than for those accomplished before their introduction.

## Figure 1.1 Hypothesis I.

The percent direct labor experienced by NMCBs since the introduction of minicomputers at mainbody deployment sites is statistically different than that experienced prior to their introduction.

Figure 1.2 Hypothesis II.

#### E. ACKNEWLEDGEMENT OF THE STUDY'S LIMITATIONS

Given that the minicomputers were introduced in the battalions in 1978-79, prior to the conception of this analysis, precludes the application of controlled experimental techniques in measuring the effects of minicomputers on construction productivity. This imposes the critical restriction that analysis must rely on data then available, which was not specifically designed for this study.

The lack of controlled experimental techniques is recognized as having serious impact on the validity of any findings of this research. Nonetheless, it is felt that an analysis of available data is an important prerequisite to any decision process regarding the future of minicomputers in the NCF. Accordingly, this research examines available data, constructing the best productivity measures obtainable from that data, and ascertains whether any productivity changes are discernable, while recognizing fully the limitations of those findings.

## F. ORGANIZATION OF THESIS

Chapter One identifies the basic problem area being studied, states the objectives of the research and the related hypotheses in general terms, and addresses the limitations and organization of the study.

Chapter Two provides background information on the mission, organization, and tasking of NMCBs, and the context within which this study is being made. It addresses the concept of productivity, its seemingly elusive nature, and the practical difficulties associated with its measurement, particularly in the construction industry. The chapter concludes with an examination of productivity questions within the NMCBs.

Chapter Three begins with a definition of a cost per manday term as a new productivity index, based upon data available within the Naval Construction Force (NCF). Factors are developed as independent variables for subsequent analysis. An initial refinement of data is then followed by a discussion and statement of the hypotheses,

the final analysis, and findings. The chapter concludes with a section on sensitivity analysis.

Chapter Four is structured similarly to chapter three. Percent direct labor, a level of effort indicator, is discussed as an established productivity measure in the NCF. The development of data elements is then presented for 40 of 42 deployments, covering a five year period at five deployment sites. A discussion of the hypotheses follows, with the chapter concluding with the analysis, findings, and sensitivity analysis.

Chapter Five, Conclusions and Recommendations, summarizes the analysis and provides conclusions and recommendations for further study.

## II. PRODUCTIVITY MEASUREMENT WITHIN THE NMCBS

The first section of this chapter describes the NMCBs, including their organization, mission, concept of operations, and typical peacetime tasking. This section is intended to provide an understanding of the basic environment within which productivity concerns are addressed.

The second section reviews the concept of productivity, addresses the background leading to the current level of appreciation of the importance of productivity, and reviews the definition of productivity and the practical difficulties in its measurement. General construction industry productivity is discussed. This section is intended to provide information on both the progress made in the field of productivity analysis and the uncertainty that remains.

The chapter concludes by addressing questions of productivity in the private and the public sectors, and specifically the NMCBs. While there are some corollaries between civilian construction firms and NMCBs during peacetime, there are also many dissimilarities.

#### A. U. S. NAVAL MOBILE CONSTRUCTION BATTALIONS (NMCBS)

1. <u>Mission and Composition of the NMCBs</u>

The mission of the NMCBs is delineated in a Chief of Naval Operations Instruction as follows:

The active NMCBs are established units of the Naval operating forces and are components of the Naval Construction Forces (NCF). The mission of the NMCBs is to provide responsive military construction support to naval, Marine Corps and other forces in military operations, to construct base facilities, and to conduct defensive operations as required by the circumstances of the deployment situation. In time of emergency or disaster, NMCBs shall conduct disaster control and recovery operations, including emergency public works operating functions, as directed. [Ref. 3] An NMCB has a normal peacetime allowance of 21 cfficers and 562 enlisted men, 464 of whom are of construction ratings, i.e. Occupational Field 13 [Ref. 4]. A summary of the peacetime manning allowance is provided as Figure C.1 in Appendix C. The battalions have a specific, detailed allowance of supplies, construction material, tools, equipment and vehicles. This is referred to as the Table Of Allowance, or TOA. An indication of the intent of the allowance is provided by the following quote:

The organic NMCB Table of Allowance will be capable of sustaining for 90 days (1800 construction hours), without resupply, construction operations planned or envisioned under contingency or general war conditions... The allowance may be utilized for peacetime employment of the NMCBs for training and maintaining readiness, and may be augmented with additional assets assigned to the Commanders in Chief, U. S. Pacific and Atlantic Fleets, as necessary, to meet specific employment requirements... Construction materials, special tools and special equipment not in the NCP inventory but required for direct use in accomplishing the project, or funds for the project sponsor... [Ref. 3]

The concepts of operation for NMCBs during wartime and during peacetime are provided as follows:

NMCBs are intended to provide responsive construction support at Navy support bases in forward areas or in combat zones to which Navy and/or Marine Corps forces are committed. NMCBs shall be capable of constructing advanced base facilities that may be reasonably expected to be required in the combat zone or at forward area support bases. Normally, in the combat zone, NMCB-built facilities will be limited to initial, intermediate and temporary construction standards ...; capability for permanent construction at Navy support bases, however, will be maintained. NMCBs will not normally be tasked to perform maintenance on shcre facilities. Peacetime employment. In reacetime, NMCBs shall undertake construction projects which maintain their construction capabilities and enhance their readiness to accomplish this mission. Special emphasis will be placed upon projects which contribute directly to overall improved Navy readiness. [Ref. 3]

## 2. <u>Deployment Sites</u>

During the period 1977-81, the eight active NMCBs were homeported at the Construction Battalion Centers (CBC) at Gulfrort, Mississippi and Port Hueneme, California. They deployed to Diego Garcia, British Indian Ocean Territories; to Okinawa, Japan: to Guam: to Puerto Rico: and to Rota, Each battalion additionally deployed detachments Spain. from the mainbody to various military bases in the general geographic area of the mainbody deployment site, as required by their tasking. The deployment cycle was normally 6 months in homeport, followed by 8 months deployed, with the battalion rotating through four of the deployment sites on NMCE Three was the exception. consecutive deployments. Beginning in April, 1977 it was split into a Blue and a Gold team and the teams were deployed to Okinawa on a 7 month rotational basis. This continued through mid-1982.

## 3. <u>Construction Tasking</u>

While construction tasking varied from deployment to deployment, NMCB Four's deployment to Rota, Spain in 1980 is an example of a battalion's tasking. It had 25 principal construction projects and 10 fill-in projects (defined as under 100 mandays of direct labor) at the mainbody site, representing 14,000+ mandays of labor. At the six different detachment sites. there were 27 different principal representing over 23,000 mandays of effort. projects, Projects ranged in scope from a 22,500 square foot commissary store (25,000+ mandays spread out over five deployments) to simple projects of under 100 mandays that are completed in a month.

The most intense tasking was the construction of the Naval Support Facility at Diego Garcia in the Indian Ocean. That eleven year effort included pier and airfield

facilities, water desalizination, ship and aircraft fuel storage, power facilities, and all personnel support and related public works support facilities.

Since a price tag is not set on SeaBee construction, it is not possible to determine exactly how the Naval Construction Force compares with the major United States construction contractors, based on volume of business. Using typical figures for battalion size (562 enlisted), deployment direct labor rate (34 percent), 22 days of construction a month (5 1/2 days a week), 9 hour days, and the April, 1976 average wage and fringe benefit pay scale for skilled building trades (\$11.52/hour) [Ref. 5], the eight battalions collectively would put in close to a guarter million mandays, or \$26,150,750 of direct lator effort a year, over the 5 deployment sites. This figure is exclusive of indirect, overhead, and material costs. While these costs will vary by type and location of the project, it is the experience of the author that a conservative estimate for indirect and overhead costs would be 30 percent and 15 percent respectively, of the direct labor and material Assuming for comparison that \$29.29 costs. of direct material costs are associated with each manday of direct labor (see table & 34cpm) and using figures of 30 percent indirect costs, 15 percent overhead costs, and 10 percent the annual value of work in place would equal profit, \$55,153,960 as shown in Figure 2.1 below. At \$50 million, the Naval Construction Force would have ranked around 182 among the Engineering News Record's top 400 United States contractors in 1975 [Ref. 6: r. 74]. A key management concern for a force of this size is how to improve productivity.

Direct Labor Mdays Direct Labor Cost Material Costs Total Direct Costs Indirect Costs Di 34 x x 9 x 22 x 12 9 x\$11.52 \$29.29 225 225 X = 562 X X \$26 Direct costs x .30 = subtotal u Direct & Indirect x .15 = erhead Costs subtotal plus 10 percent Profit \$5 Tota

Figure 2.1 Estimated Annual Work in Place by the NCF.

#### B. PRODUCTIVITY

1

1. <u>General</u>

Productivity is a pervasive factor in life, whether or not it is recognized as such.

One key economic factor adversely affecting the United States is the dramatic general decline in the rate of increase in productivity. This affects the U.S. trade balance, the acceleration of inflation, the number of jobs available, and the very guality of life. The 1978 Economic Report of the President of the United States cited it as 'one of the most significant problems of recent years.' [Ref. 7: p. 137]

a. Productivity, Efficiency, and Effectiveness

For any construction organization, productivity statistics can be aggregated at various levels and used differently, depending upon the level of aggregation. The basic level of productivity analysis is the unit production of specific work items per man-hour of labor input. While this can generally be objectively determined, it is difficult to use in a practical sense. The unit production concept results in a bewildering sprawl of data. Individual operations can only be compared with similar operations in

the same generic family. Comparisons are not possible between dissimilar work of the same trade or operations of different trades.

A more advanced level would be that of the finished product, be it a new building, a car, or any other product that has value in and of itself and which is related to the inputs required to produce it. These two levels of productivity analysis can be related to efficiency and Efficiency is seen as productivity at the effectiveness. unit production level, or micro-productivity. Efficiency is relatively easy to determine and highly reliable, yet it is of limited usefulness due to its severely restricted applicability. Effectiveness on the other hand can be related to productivity at the project level, or macro-productivity. This attempts to measure how effectively all the input resources were utilized in arriving at the finished product. Macro-productivity is relatively difficult to determine, and consequently it is often of questionable reliability. Properly developed however, it could be extremely useful in comparing different management techniques, capital/labor mixes, and construction techniques. This information is summarized in figure 2.2.

The Hierarchy Model of Construction Productivity [Ref. 7] goes further and suggests that productivity is influenced at all levels of our society, from the formulation of national policy on such diverse issues as the federal budget, the environment, and social programs (i.e., support for small business and handicapped programs) to the development of building codes, union/management relations, and the forms of contractual documents utilized in the industry.

In short, while it is often easiest to focus on the productivity of the individual worker, construction efficiency or macro-productivity is most effected by decisions made before construction legins.



Effectiveness, not efficiency, is the major issue. Increased productivity is obtained by working smarter, not necessarily harder. Feople generally want to produce and feel productive. They will attempt to appear productive and "do work" even if it isn't "effective work." The problem is to establish a climate for the most effective operation considering all elements of the work process. [Ref. 7: p. 142]

b. The Productivity Ratio

The common measure of productivity is the ratio of physical output, such as products or services, to the inputs, labor, capital and natural resources, required to produce that output. The inputs listed are commonly referred to as the factors of production. When all three of the factors of production are used, the resultant productivity ratio is often referred to as the total factor productivity ratio, or more accurately a multi-factor productivity ratio in recognition that some inputs in labor, capital, or natural resources will not be measurable. Often productivity data refers to cnly one of the factors of production, the most common being labor. Such a productivity ratio would properly be referred to as a labor productivity ratio. [Ref. 8: p. 3] [Ref. 9: p. 25]

The usefulness of a particular productivity ratio lies in its comparability with similar ratios. Taken alone, it provides little if any value. Productivity is good or had only when compared to another period's productivity, or another unit's productivity if the productivity ratios are derived in the same manner. Time series productivity statistics are published by various sources such as the Department of Commerce, the Department of Labor's Bureau of Labor Statistics, or various private productivity research centers such as the American Productivity Center.

7

The term productivity ratio, while commonly used hy many people, is often misunderstood. It is in a sense, an abstract entity. Basically this is because the inputs and outputs are nominal units of resources and associated products, respectively, with measurements often made in dollar terms out of practical necessity. The dollar measures are adjusted for inflation, changes in quality, and price fluctuations due to varying market conditions. With a 5 percent change in productivity being a typical range of interest in productivity studies, it is easy to appreciate the difficulties encountered in data refinement. While it is highly doubtful that a productivity ratio could be used meaningfully to determine average profit margins, a total output to total input ratio would suggest this possibility.

The value of productivity statistics lies in their ability to communicate trends in productive efficiency and the relative contributions to productivity of each of the factors of production. If intra-industry comparisons were available and valid, these figures would give a macroindication of the inherent productive capability of each firm. Whether that relative capability is achieved is a result of a number of influences, not the least of which are general economic conditions.

# 2. The Development of Productivity Measurement

Productivity concepts have evolved from a recognition of labor as the sole productive input to the recognition of capital goods and land as part of the total factor productivity concept which is in wide use today. In 1776, Adam Smith wrote

The annual produce of any nation can be increased in its value by no means other than by increasing either the number of its productive labourers, or the productive powers of those labourers who had before been employed. [Ref. 10: p. 20]

The additional recognition of man-made capital goods and land as inputs in the production function, in the latter nineteenth century, provided the basis for our present day concept of total factor productivity. Some refinements have addressed human resource accounting concepts in adjusting the guality of labor input and environmental/guality of life considerations as part of the output.

Interest in productivity in the United States has usually been inversely related to general economic condi-The first estimates in the United States were by the tions. Bureau of Labor of the Department of Interior in the mid-1880's, resulting from concern about the causes and consequences of industrial depression. The National Bureau of Economic Research, a private, nonprofit organization, began developing and publishing productivity studies of various industries and the national economy in the 1930's spurred on by the Great Depression.

The National Research Project of the Works Progress Administration provided another intensive set of studies in the 1930's. Upon termination of this Project, productivity measurement responsibilities were transferred to the Division of Productivity and Technological Development in

the Bureau of Labor Statistics (BLS) in 1940. The BLS continues to collect and publish productivity statistics, having progressed from output per hour in selected industries to plant level productivity studies and annual and guarterly estimates for the entire economy, which can be subdivided into major segments of the economy. Valid international comparisons of productivity of a limited number of countries began in the 1950s. [Ref. 11]

While the Labor Department's productivity figures have always been based on labor productivity, the Commerce Department has published total factor productivity estimates for the nonfinancial corporate sector on an irregular basis since 1972. The Department of Agriculture and Department of Interior publish productivity ratios for segments of the economy within their fields of interest.

Private sector research and statistics on productivity are provided by the National Bureau of Economic Research, the Conference Board, the Business Roundtable, and by various institutes and universities. In addition, productivity centers have gained prominence both in the U. S and overseas, generally as government sponsored organizations responsible for three major functions:

- Education: to sponsor studies, to provide information and to promote public understanding of the significance of productivity increases.
- 2. Promotion: advocacy within the government of rolicies and programs to promote productivity.
- Coordination: providing a forum in which representatives of labor, management, government, and other groups can exchange views on productivity. [Ref. 10: p. 24]

## a. Measurement Difficulties

Productivity is easy to understand but difficult to operationalize. There are difficulties in identifying and quantifying the inputs in the denominator and the the numerator of the productivity ratio. outputs in Research on productivity is normally constrained by the availability of applicable data. The relevance of a particular theory on productivity change lies in its ability to explain the past and project into the future. Studies on time series changes in productivity often must rely on data that has been collected for other purposes. This is a difficult process, at best. Labor productivity studies tend to be more common as labor data is routinely collected and retained for other purposes. [Lef. 12] [Ref. 9]

If spurious fluctuations in the productivity ratio are to be eliminated, the denominator must include all inputs, and only those inputs, which result in the outputs included in the numerator. If additional inputs are inadvertently included, charges in those extraneous inputs, while having nothing to do with the actual output being considered, would result in changes in the related productivity ratio.

Likewise, the outputs must include all and only those outputs which result from the inputs in the denominator. If additional outputs are included in the numerator which are unrelated to the input in the denominator, measured changes in those outputs would occur when there was no change in the input, resulting in an erroneous productivity ratio. Similarly, if some inputs are omitted, changes in them, which would affect output, would not be included in the denominator, thus distorting the productivity ratio. [Ref. 9: p. 24]

Reflection on the significance of the cause and effect requirement when determining productivity ratios illustrates the difficulty in establishing accurate measures. Consider the following:

Activity: Trench Excavation

Output: Ditch, point A to point B. Input: One laborer and one shovel. Productivity ratio = (Ditch, point A to B) (laborer and shovel)

Assuming that it tock the laborer one day (eight hours) to dig the twenty feet of ditch, using one shovel, then the productivity ratio is 20/8 =2.25 linear feet of ditch per laborer manhour, w/shcvel.

Since the value of the productivity ratio lies in its comparison with other comparable ratios, it is reasonable to ask several questions. How much use would one have for such a ratic? Should it be more generalized? Have all the factors that would affect the productivity of the laborer been accounted for? The answers to these questions are all related.

It is highly probable that the laborer's output was affected by several things not addressed, such as the cross-section of the ditch, the terrain that it was located on, the relative ease of digging the material encountered, the type of shovel, the ability and motivation of the laborer, the weather conditions, and whether shoring was required. These considerations must be identified and dealt with in one of two ways: 1) either become part of the description of a much more restricted productivity ratio, or properly quantified as part of output or input. 2) The second option differs from the first in a practical sense,

only if the various input and output factors can be combined in like terms. Units are an obvious problem; the practical solution is to use dollars as a measure of both "nominal units" of output and cf input.

Having labor priced at \$10.00 an hour, depreciation on the shovel priced at \$1.00 per hour, and the finished product priced at \$100.00, the productivity ratio thus becomes \$100/ \$80 + \$8 or 1.13. More difficult ditches (i.e., harder material, adverse weather) would "sell" at a higher price. But likewise, they would take longer to dig and/or require an implement other than a shovel, with a different depreciation rate. The productivity of different ditch digging operations could be compared, given that both inputs and outputs could be accurately priced.

Manufacturing, as an industry, lends itself more to productivity analysis. In general, it is a relatively repetitive process under relatively controlled conditions, where profit is strongly related to productivity. Still, measurement difficulties persist. A 1979 National Academy of Sciences report titled Measurement and Interpretation of Productivity noted three general types of guality changes in the output of durable goods, yet indicated only one of the types is properly dealt with in Bureau of Labor and Statistics reports [Ref. 11: p. 100-102].

The limitations of the present methodology are apparent when it is noted that quality change can take one of three forms. First, a quality change can take the form of a change in the quantity of costly resources used to produce a product. This "type 1" quality change, such as the addition of a remote control device to a television set or a heavier bumper to an automobile, is adequately treated now for many categories of goods. Second, a quality change can be achieved by a technological innovation that raises the quality of a product without any increase in current resource inputs. An important example of this "type 2" quality change is the development of new models of electronic computers that have larger memories and more rapid computational abilities but that cost roughly the same as the models they replace. Third, any consumer or producer durable good simultaneously provides services to its users and imposes costs on them in the form of operation expenses, \_\_\_\_

particularly energy requirements and maintenance. These operation costs may be trivial for some durable goods (furniture may need only an cccasional bit of polish), but for some goods, such as electrical generating equipment and commercial jet aircraft, cumulative operating costs over a product's life may be many times larger than the initial capital cost. This "type 3" quality change refers to any design changes in durable goods that result in higher or lower operating costs, holding constant both the quantity of services provided by the good and the wages and prices of the inputs used in its operation. A reduction in the price of gasoline that makes automobiles less expensive to operate is not a type 3 quality change, but the redesign of an engine to improve fuel efficiency is.

The report goes on to note that the Bureau of Labor and Statistics has well established procedures for dealing with type 1 changes, but is generally ineffective in adjusting the value of output fcr type 2 and 3 changes, due presumedly to difficulties in objective measurement. One must guestion the validity of productivity statistics that do not give credit in evaluating output to design innovations that increase the operational capability of a product or that reduce the ownership costs of the product.

The above examples are intended to convey an idea of the extent to which inputs and outputs can be identified, guantified, and adjusted, in developing productivity statistics.

Some economists refer to the change in output that is unexplained by a related change in input as a "measure of our ignorance." Increases in output do not happen by chance; they are caused by something. That something must be identified to determine if in fact it is an input previously overlooked. If so, it should be quantified and included, thus reducing the unexplained change in output. It is generally felt that a more complete understanding of the basic production function will make possible proper guantification of all inputs, many of which are presently unknown or improperly quartified. With such a search proceeding to narrow "the extent of our ignorance" it is

easy to appreciate the range of factors considered by economists in the measurement of inputs and outputs, and the resulting complexity of the process. [Ref. 12: p.1031,1035]

# 3. <u>Construction</u> <u>Industry Froductivity in the Private</u> <u>Sector</u>

The construction industry is a vital segment of the national economy. It employs over 10 percent of the work force, contributes over 10 percent of the GNP, and significantly affects commitments of 30-40 percent of our national resources. "The industry is highly fragmented and diversified and is composed of over 800,000 construction contractors, ranging from a few giants ... to the majority of contractors that employ less than 20 employees." [Ref. 7: p. 138] [Ref. 8]

Because of its size, productivity within the construction industry has important macro-economic implications for the country as a whole. Its diversity however causes significant problems in productivity measurement. Recent literature varies on the extent of decline in productivity growth in construction, but there is general agreement that it has declined markedly more than productivity in the economy as a whole. [Ref. 7]

It should be noted that despite the complexities illustrated above, productivity statistics are more readily available for manufacturing than for the construction industry. This is a direct reflection of the construction industries diversity, relative to the quantities of output produced. The Bureau of Labor Statistics data on construction productivity are considered unreliable by the BLS and are not published. Construction Productivity Frontiers [Ref. 13] notes that "construction is among the major industries whose productivity we know least about."

# 4. <u>Productivity in the Naval Mobile Construction</u> <u>Battalions</u>

In public sector productivity studies, an inherent difficulty is that the product is not normally sold, and as such the standard method of establishing the value of the product is lost. This invariably leads to the use of changes in inputs as proxies for changes in output. [Ref. 9: p. 23]

In the NCF, productivity studies are hampered by the two major factors mentioned above: it involves construction work and it is in the public sector. Measurement difficulties do not negate the need for analysis however, they only complicate it.

As with any military unit, the NMCBs peacetime mission is intended to provide training for their mission in time of war. While productivity is a key issue with any organization, the peacetime deployments of NMCBs are not justified on cost competitiveness with the private sector, but on the basis that deployment construction projects provide the best combination of construction experience and mobilization training for dollar cost to the government. [Ref. 14]

Military activities receiving construction support from the NCF normally fund only the material costs, special equipment/tool costs and other direct costs to the NCF that are associated with the project. Fixed costs associated with the battalion, its TOA, and its deployment are not passed on to the activity. This includes personnel and travel costs. With this funding arrangement, NCF accomplishment of a project should always be cheaper for the activity than private sector accomplishment, where all direct, indirect and overhead costs must be recouped.

The true cost of NCF accomplishment does include all direct, indirect and overhead ccsts, but the output is more

than the completion of assigned construction projects. It includes the forward deployment of a Naval Mobile Construction Battalion, at all times, in each of five overseas locations. Two of those battalions, the Pacific and the Atlantic Alert Battalions, are ready and fully equipped to redeploy in support of contingency operations within six days of initial notification, with the construction equipmaterial and supplies necessary to provide ment, tools, construction support in a combat environment for 90 days without resupply (fuel, subsistence rations, and ammunition are based on a 15 day requirement). Additionally, each Lattalion is required to maintain the capability to redeploy, on 48 hours notice, an air detachment of 90 selected personnel with tools, equipment, and construction supplies for 30 days of self-sustained construction effort. [Ref. 3]

As such, it is inappropriate to attempt to justify the use of the NCF for overseas construction projects based on a comparison with private sector bids for similar work. Productivity comparisons between the NCF and the private sector would tend to ignore the differing missions of the two groups.

Nonetheless, construction productivity is an essential element of NMCB readiness. Since tasking can be expected to exceed available construction resources, particularly during wartime, construction productivity is always important. As in the construction industry, productivity issues in the NCF will be better addressed at the macro level, where decisions are made that have real impact on the amount of resources required to provide the necessary product. While efficiency on individual work tasks is important, the effectiveness with which the final product is provided is what ultimately counts.

## III. CONSTRUCTION PRODUCTIVITY, ANALYSIS AND FINDINGS

The first section of this chapter discusses the rationale for using cost per manday (CPM) as a productivity measure, and presents the hypothesis to be tested. The data elements used in the analysis are developed, followed by an initial data refinement. The final analysis and findings are then presented, followed by a sensitivity analysis.

## A. CPH AS A PRODUCTIVITY MEASURE

The intent of the analysis is the determination of the effect of NMCB minicomputer support on deployment construction productivity. An examination of existing reporting procedures failed to disclose an accepted productivity index in the NCF, in the traditional cutput over input form.

Since a limiting constraint in NMCB construction is that of direct labor construction personnel, a labor productivity measure is desired. The initial benefit analysis justifying the introduction of minicomputers in the NCF stated that one of the primary benefits of the computer would lie in the increase in efficiency made possible by better, more responsive scheduling. The analysis estimated that shorter construction times would result from an increase in productivity of the direct labor personnel. [Ref. 1: p. 12] This productivity change should therefore be revealed by an analysis of output per manday of direct labor.

Development of a productivity index for the NMCBs is hampered by the availability of data and the fact that it involves public sector construction. Typical to the public sector, the output does not have a sale price fixing its value on the open market, and the diversity associated with

the construction industry precludes assigning a price based on similar projects.

Given the above limitations, the "productivity ratio" developed is that of the material cost of the job (input as a proxy for output) over the mardays of direct labor charged to the job. This labor productivity ratio is termed "Cost per Manday" or CPM. The resulting hypothesis is restated from Figure 1.1 in Chapter I.

Hypothesis I: the dollar cost of material in place per direct labor manday is statistically different for construction projects accomplished since the introduction of minicomputers at the mainbody sites, than for those accomplished before their introduction.

#### B. DATA ELEMENTS USED IN ANALYSIS

#### 1. <u>Overview</u>

Using data on projects at Diego Garcia, Rota, and Puerto Rico, measures of the ccst per manday were developed as indicators of construction productivity. Time constraints precluded traveling to the 30th NCK in Guam to obtain and/or validate the necessary project data for Guam and Okinawa to allow inclusion of cost per manday analysis for projects at these locals. Accordingly, only projects at Puerto Rico, Diego Garcia, and Rota, Spain were used.

The data used in the CPM portion of the analysis is project-related instead of deployment-related. A total of six data elements were obtained for each project. Three data elements (cost, mandays, and project start date), were used to derive the dependent variable CPM for each project.
The CPM figures were analyzed using three nonmetric, categorical data elements or factors (Location, ADF, and Project Type) as the independent variables.

Each case was assigned a categorical confidence factor of from one to four indicating the degree of confidence in the data. This allowed inclusion of all projects in the data list, with subsequent decisions made on what to include in different analysis.

Figure 3.1 summarizes the data elements used, the coding for the nonmetric variables and the sources for the data. It is followed by a more detailed description of the data elements and the rationale for their use.

The primary sources of data are the Deployment Completion Reports (DCR), turnover letters (TOL) to the ROICC upon completion, Bills of Materials (BM), and Estimate at project Completion (EAC) reports listing material or special tool/equipment costs charged to the projects.

Table 6 in Appendix A provides a complete listing of the data and the refinement factors (index, deflater, and adjusted cost) used in the analysis.

2. CPM, the Dependent Variable

a. Input Measure, Direct Labor Mandays

Direct labor mandays for each project form the denominator of the productivity ratio. Mandays were not converted to a dollar value because data is not retained on the mandays by pay grade of the direct labor personnel. While a statistical average is used for costing the job on plant account records, use of it here would give a false sense of refinement, as it does not take into account the mix of wage rates applied to the project. Use of mandays in the denominator precludes a unitless index, however the resultant ratio would be directly related to one where the input was costed at a fixed, average rate per manday.

Data Element	Value	Source
Manday s	varies	DCR
(Project) Cost	varies	EAC, BM
Start	YY. MM	DCR
ADP	1 NO ALP 2 0-25% W/ADP 3 25-75% W/ADP 4 75-95% W/ADP 5 100% W/ADP	DCR and CESO
Loc (ation)	1 Puerto Riço 2 Rota, Spain 5 Diegc Garcia	DCR
Type (project)	<ol> <li>Standard bldg, normal elect/ mechanical.</li> <li>Warehouse, basic shop, w/ min. utilities of finish work.</li> <li>Building w/ more than normal utilities, finis</li> <li>Electrical distribution systems.</li> <li>Paving</li> <li>Airfields.</li> <li>Pier work.</li> <li>Mechanical distribution systems.</li> <li>other.</li> </ol>	Subjective evaluation by author or
Conf (idence)	<ul> <li>Data looks valid.</li> <li>Dates suspect.</li> <li>Type suspect.</li> <li>Date/type suspect.</li> <li>Mandays/cost suspect.</li> </ul>	Subjective evaluation by author

「「「ないない」「「「「なななななな」」「「ない」」」「「ないないない」」」」「ないない」」」」」」

Figure 3.1 Data Elements Otilized in Analysis of CPM.

There were generally two possible sources of data for direct labor mandays, (1) the deployment completion report listing the completed project and (2) the turnover

letters from the battalion completing the project to the Resident Officer in Charge of Construction (ROICC), who is the project administrator that accepts the finished project from the battalion. Differences could occur where additional work was required on the project after issuance of the turnover letter. Where differences did occur, they were generally small and the higher manday value was taken on the assumption that subsequent work had been performed which was omitted from the other source.

b. Output Measure

General. Output in the government sector (1) is difficult to quantify in dollars because of the lack of competition in "selling" the product. within the NCF, an acquisition cost is associated with each completed project, based on direct costs charged to the project funds (materials, special tools, equipment and tool rental charges, and any purchased services) plus statistical costs for military direct labor charged to the project, at a set rate per hour. All indirect and overhead labor costs are excluded, because NCF accounting procedures do not allocate them to the various jobs. In craer to allocate these costs to the projects an allocation scheme would in all probability have to be based on direct labor hours. Thus it would tend to mask differences in job types and in the effect minicomputers have had on productivity. The effect of minicomputers on indirect/overhead labor costs is examined in the second productivity index, that of percent direct labor obtained on the deployment.

• The direct and indirect costs associated with transportation, living/personnel costs, and the utilization of NCF construction equipment and tools are also excluded from the cost of construction in place. The exclusion of the latter two indirect costs has a more serious

effect on the validity of the analysis, because of the traditional inverse relationship between capital and labor as the factors of production. These costs must be excluded however, because of the lack of appropriate data. Equipment costs and usage are not charged to specific jobs in the NCF, if the equipment is part of the Table of Allowance. The equipment and tools are resources that are used to the extent they are available. Special equipment and tools that are not part of the Table cf Allowance, but must be purchased or rented specifically for a particular job, are listed on the Bill of Materials and charged to the job the same as material. Purchased tocls/equipment are turned over to the activity upon completion of the job. For the most part, the TOA covers the majority of tool/equipment requirements. For an overseas construction project, the excluded indirect and overhead costs could equal or exceed the direct material and labor costs. There is no established procedure for allocating these costs or actual direct labor costs to the projects. If such a procedure were available, it would provide an acquisition cost comparable to that obtained with construction through the private sector. Surrogate measures of output must be used, however, based upon available data.

The only data that approximates and would vary with the value of the finished output are the data on project material costs and direct labor. Since the intent is to identify changes in direct labor efficiency, inclusion of labor cost in the output measure would tend to minimize any change. Accordingly, the cost of material and special tools/equipment charged to the job, as a surrogate for the value of finished material in place, is chosen as the output measure.

(2) <u>Material Costs</u>. The output factor for the equation is the cost of material and special tools/equipment charged to the project. Actual cost information was sought

for each project. Analysis of the project Bill of Materials would provide this information, however complete BM files are not maintained on all projects after physical and financial completion, except for projects at Diego Garcia. (Physical completion is completion of all required work on a project. Financial completion entails the expensing of all obligations charged to project funds, with a resultant final cost. This final cost is referred to as the final "Estimate at Completion" (EAC), information of which is contained in the EAC report.)

For Kota and Puerto Rico projects, an alternate measure of material costs was required. The only information consistently available was the EAC report, showing total costs charged to project funds. Project funds are used for the purchase of all materials, and special tools, for equipment and tool rental, and for any other purchased services required in support of the project. Normally, only a small percentage of the project funds are expended for other than materials, although the percentage for some projects could be significant. It would be possible to segregate material costs by examination of the BMs, but their nonavailability makes reliance on the EAC reports a necessity. While the resultant productivity figures would be increased by the extent of other than material purchases included in the EAC, that distortion would be minimized in the analysis to the extent that its relative percent of the total FAC figure was constant from project to project. Grouping cf projects accomplished with and without the computer assisted construction management further minimizes the effect. Materials and special tcols/ equipment charged to the project will be referred to as materials hereinafter.

Material costs were provided by Commander, 31st Naval Construction Regiment (COM31stNCR), Port Hueneme,

California for Diege Garcia projects, grouped into structural, mechanical, and electrical costs. The costs were taken from the file of BMs maintained for the Diego Garcia projects.

Twenty four EAC reports were available for at the headquarters of Commander, examination the Construction Battalions, Atlantic (COMCBLANT), Norfolk, Virginia, for Puertc Rico and Rota, Spain projects. A consolidated report was issued 6 times a year, beginning in May 1978: it included both Rota and Puerto Rico. Separate reports for Puerto Rico only were available back to November, 1976. In accordance with COMCBLANTINST 10370.1. project EAC figures are reported until all orders are expensed (i.e., the government pays the vendor based on a certified invoice received from the vendor) and then the project line item is dropped from the report. The last time the project is reported, the total EAC figure shown represents the final expensed costs. While the use of expensed costs has the advantage of not relying on the accuracy of the government's initial estimate for costs, its disadvantage lies in the time required to obtain expensed cost information. Time lags ranged over a year in some cases, between physical completion and financial completion.

In summary, project cost information is based on latest EAC reported costs, through July 1982 for Puerto Rico and Rota projects, and on Bill of Material totals for Diego Garcia projects. Cost figures were then adjusted to constant 1975 dollars to factor out the effects of inflation on CPM values. Figure 3.2 applies..

Engineering News Record material costs indexes were used to convert all costs to a base year of 1975, using the official January indices for a 20 city, nationwide average for the period 1975 through 1982 [Ref. 15 through 22].



Figure 3.2 Derivation of CPM Values.

Because of "Buy American" requirements, material for NCF projects is procured by the Regiments in homeport, which are Port Hueneme, California for Facific deployment sites and Diego Garcia, and Gulfport, Mississippi for Atlantic deployment sites. Department of Defense regulations require the maximum use of the Federal stock system. Accordingly only a small percentage of the material is procured directly from commercial sources. Due to the dispersion of procurement for the federal stock system, use of a nationwide material cost index is warranted. The cost trend is shown by figure 3.3.

Project start dates were taken as the material procurement dates, due to the lack of available data on when the material was actually procured. The effect of this is mitigated by the fact that the majority of the material is procured through the Federal stock system where prices are more stabilized.

A simple regression was run to develop monthly cost indices. The regression equation, based on ENR 20 City Nationwide Cost Indices is:

Index = -7549 + (112 x year)



Figure 3.3 Official ENR January Material Cost Index.

where year is of the form xx.x (i.e., July 1980 is 80.5). The coefficient of determination (r squared) is 0.98. The base index for January 1975 (831.8) is divided by the index calculated above to provide a deflater which, when multiplied by the outyear cost, yields the adjusted cost in January 1975.

## 3. Independent Variables

a. ADP

Dates of introduction of the minicomputers were determined from Deployment Completion Reports and verified through discussions with knowledgeable personnel at the Naval Civil Engineering Support Office (CESO), Port Hueneme, California. They are listed in Table 1.

# TABLE 1

#### Introduction of Mini-Computers, by Site

Deployment SiteInitial NMCB with ADPDeployment startDiego GarciaNMCB 4July 1978Okinawa3June 1979Guam4September 1979Puerto Rico40May 1979Rota, Spain62July 1979

The DCRs were reviewed to determine the percent complete on the various projects when the computer was introduced at the deployment site. Based on the percent complete, an ADP indicator value of between 1 and 5 was assigned, categorizing the extent of the project accomplished while computer assisted construction management was available. (See Figure 3.1.)

L. Location

Figure 3.1 shows the indicator values assigned to the locations used in the analysis.

c. Project Type

The choice of categories to group the projects was a subjective one, based upon a review of the wide variety of projects included in the study. The ideal situation would be to have a large number of identical projects with an equal number performed before and at each site, after introduction of the minicomputers. This is the crux of the problem regarding the study of construction productivity; seldom are any two projects exactly alike. Lacking identical projects, the projects were grouped based upon descriptive information and project photographs available in the DCRs into the types listed in figure 3.1.

## d. Confidence

In the course of accumulating the data, it became apparent that not all data enjoyed the same confidence level. Examples include the subjective area of determination of project type, and relatively objective areas with multiple data sources and conflicting data, such as project costs or mandays. Rather than initially exclude such projects, they were included with a category factor assigned indicating the area(s) where the data was questionable, as shown in Figure 3.1.

## 4. Initial Data Befinement

Appendix A is a listing of the data values used in the analysis for the 151 projects for which data was available. Included are derived figures for the cost index (INDEX), deflater, adjusted cost (ADJ\$), and cost per manday (CPM). Tables 7 through 9 in Appendix B show the distribution of project data compiled by location, and table 2 below is a summary for all locations by type and confidence level.

Table 3 arrays project types by confidence rating. Data for which the start or completion dates were suspect (CONF 1), the type was suspect (CONF 3 and/or 2), or the mandays or cost were suspect (CCNF 4) were excluded from the analysis. There are only five projects with CONF = 1 or 2, four of which are projects of the type 6 or 9 which are excluded for reasons noted below. There were no projects with conf = 3, and conf = 4 was necessarily excluded because the primary data being analyzed was suspect for one reason or another.

In the analysis that follows, project types 1, 2, 3, 5, and 8 were utilized. Types 4, 6, and 7 were necessarily excluded because all projects were with ADP = 5. Type 9 was

TABLE 2

ſ

Summary Cross-tabulation of 151 CPM Projects

ROW TOTAL	27.2	17.9	12.6	0 • •	10.6
нн	┥┝┥┝┥┝┥┝ ╵		┥┝┥┝┥┝┥┝┥┝	┥┝┥╞┥╒┥┍┥┝	
ons 100% ADP 5	25.5 15.2 15.2	59-3 17-8 10-6	47.4 10.0 6.0	100.5 3.60	68.88 12.22 7.3
All Locati 75-99% ADP	0000	0000	100.0 100.0 100.0		0000
Levels 25-75% ADP 3	60.03 60.03 60.03	0000	0000	0000	200.10 20.00 20.10
nfidence 0-25% ADP 2 I	22 22 22 22	0000	25°.0	0000	0000
ADP I I	974 974 238 238	710 710 710 710 710	15. 7 35. 7 36. 7	0000	25.0 25.0 2.6
COUNT I ROW PCT I COL PCT I TOT PCT I	IFE	BLDG, MINIMUM 2 I I 2 NUISH 2 I I 1 I I I I I I I I I I I I I I I I I	3 I BUILDING WITH 3 I MORE THAN NORMAL I FINISH/UTILITIES I	ELECTRICAL 4 I DISTRIBUTION I SYSTEM	PAVING 5

ഗന

-

.

Table 2

Summary Cross-takulation of 151 CPM Projects (cont'd.)

	TOTAL	1.32	2.03	6 • 0	19.2	100.0
	HHH	┥┢┥┝┥┝┥┝┥┝ I	нымыны I	анныны I	┥┝┥ <sub>┣┥</sub> ╋┽┢┥┝	<b>⊣</b>
	ons 100% ADP 5	50.0 1.1 0.7	100 33.30 2.03	66 - 7 66 - 7 41 - 0	55.2 55.2 17.8 10.6	90-65
•		┥┝┥┝┥┝┥┝┥┝	┥┡┥┠┥┠┥┣┑┡ ╎	┥┝┥┝┥┝┥┝┥	┥┝┥╽╼┝┥┝┥┡	-1
	1 Loca 75-997 ADP	0000	0000	0000	0000	0.7
	A H	чынын	, ЧННЧН	┥┝┥╞┥┝┥┝	і чынчыны	    
1	evels 25-75% ADP 3	0000	0000	0000	20.04 20.04 20.04	
	а и и	╕ ┥┝┥╘┥┝┥╞┥╞ ╏	ı Чынынын І	╹ ┥┡┥┝┥┝┥┝┥┝	┙ ┥┝┥┝┥┝┥┝┥┝┥┝┥┝	 
1	fidenc 0-25% ADP 2	0000	0000	000	2000 2000 1000	2.6
	чн Co	╻ ┥┝┥┝┥┝┥┝┥┝┽┢ ┃	╸ ┥┝┥┝┥╞┥┝┥╒	╷ ┥┝┥┝┥┝┥┝┥┝	ныныны	, 4 ,
	All NO ADP	50.0 2.0	0000	00 mm 00 mm	34.5 19.6	51 33 <b>.</b> 8
	нннн	¦ →HHHHHH I	┥┍┥┍┥┍┥┝┥┝	┃ ┥┝┥┝┥┝┥┝┥┝┥┝	┙┝┥┝┥┝┥┝┥ ╵	; -1
	PCT PCT TCT TCT	Q	~	œ	S	TAL
		AIRFIELD	PIEF WORK	IECHANICAL IISTRIBUTION SYSTEM	JTHER	COLU
	5		-		-	

.

5

TABLE 3

Cross-tabulation of 151 CPM Projects, by Type and Confidence

RON TOTAL	41 27-2	17.9	12.6	იი ო ო	10.6
н	анарарар I	ныныны		нынын I	
DATA Valid 5	11 82.9 12 82.9 22.55	11 74 1 16.8	11 73.7 11.8 19.3	11 100 34 00 100 100	14 13, 14 19, 3
VALUE BOTH SUSPECT	17-1. 25-9. 4-6	55 4 55 7 7 7 7 7 7 7 7 7 7 7 7 7 7 7 7	21-14 14-8 2-6	0000	12.52 1.34 1.34
CONFIDENCE TYPE SUSPECT				0000 0000	
I LATES		0000 000	-70.0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0	0000 000	0000
COUNT ROW PCT COL PCT TOT PCT	STANDARD BUILDING	BUILDING WITH MININUM FINISH	BUILDING WITH MORE THAN NORMAL FINISH/UTILITIES	ELECTRICAL DISTRIBUTION SYSTEM	PAVING 5 -

46

Cross-tabulation of 151 CPM Projects, by Type and Confidence (cont'd) Table 3

ROW TOTAL	1.32	2.0	6 <b>.</b> 0	19.2	100.0
н	нынын 1	┥┝┥┝┥┝┥┝ ╿	┥┝┥┝┥┝┥┝┥┝ ╿	┥┝┥┝┥┝┥┝ I	
VALID 5	50.0 0.3 0.7	66.7 66.7 1.3	77 . 7 5.9 4.6	14 14 14 14 14 5 7 22 14 5 7 22	119 78.8
Ч	ннннн Т	╻ ┥╞┥┝┥┝┥┝┥┝┥┝	- ныныны I	ныныны	, 
VALUE OTH USPECT	0000	а 33 0.1 1	22.22 7.4	14.8 14.8 2.6	17.9
- н <sup>б</sup> он	і нняная	і Чыңыңың	і Нынананар	┥ <sub>┝┥┝┥┝┥┝</sub>	i H
ONFIDENC TYPE SUSPECT 2	50.0	0000	0000	50.0 50.0	1.32
U H	ннннн !	┥┝┥┝┥┝┥┝┥┝ ╿	┥╄┥╒┥┝┥┝┥	нннн	-1
ATES JSPECT	0000	0000	0000	6.9 66.7	0 M
	¦ ннннн	- -	ананана	ныныны	4
PCT PCT	6	~	80	6	AL
C C O UN C C O UN T O T	TYPE AIRPIELD	PIEF WORK	MECHANICAL DISTRIBUTION SYSTEM	OTHER	COLU
	-				

excluded because of the high standard deviation, however that was expected due to the project grouping of "other".

Projects with partial but not complete overlap with ADP (ADP 2,3,4) were initially included in the data list to provide a more complete accounting for the projects in the period covered by the analysis. They are excluded from the analysis however because of the unwarranted loss of degrees of freedom for the small increase in the number of projects covered. Of the 89 projects remaining after the above refinements, there were two projects with an ADP value of 2, three with a value of 3, and none with a value of 4.

This left 84 projects, which are summarized by TYPE and ADP in Table 4 below.

COUNT I ROW PCT I COL PCT I TOT PCT I	AI NO ADP 1	DP 100% ADP 5	ROW Į TOTAL
STANDARD 1 BUILDING 1	10 32.3 32.3 11.9	21 39.6 67.7 25.0	1 31 1 36.9 1
2 BUILDING WITH MINIMUM FINISH	9 29.0 45.0 10.7	11 20.8 55.0 13.1	1 20 1 23.8 1
BUILDING WITH MORE THAN NORMAL I FINISH/UTILITIES	5 16.1 38.5 6.0	8 15.1 61.5 1 9.5	13 1 15.5
PAVING 5	4 12.9 30.8 4.8	9 17.0 69.2 10.7	13 1 15.5 1
MECHANICAL 8 DISTRIBUTION 1 SYSTEM 1	3 9.7 42.9 3.9	4 7.5 57.1 4.8	1 7 I 8.3 I
COLUMN TOTAL	31 36.9	53 63.1	L

#### TABLE 4

Summary Cross-tabulation of 84 Projects

These cases, which are used in the final analysis, are annotated in Table 6 in Appendix A. Tables 10 through 12 in Appendix B provide a cross-tabulation of project TYPE by ADP for each Location. Table 13 in Appendix B is a breakdown of CPM by TYPE, ADP, and LOC for the 84 projects used in the final analysis.

### C. CPH ANALYSIS AND FINDINGS

For the analysis that follows in both this chapter and chapter IV, an interactive software program, Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS) was used for analysis of variance (ANOVA) and multiple classification analysis (MCA) calculations. Multiple contrast of means calculations were made utilizing a computer software system for data analysis by the Statistical Analysis System (SAS) Institute, Inc. Both were used on an IBM 3033 mainframe computer.

The standard analysis of variance is a statistical test to determine the probability of error if the difference in means between the two groups being analyzed are assumed to be equal. The hypothesis that the difference is zero is commonly referred to as the null hypothesis. The ANOV A determines the F statistic, and the significance of the F statistic, as a test of the null hypothesis. The significance level of the test is commonly taken to be 5 percent, which relates to a 95 percent confidence level. The significance level, or significance of F, is also called the Prob-value or p-value. It shows the extent to which the data supports the null hypothesis. P-values of 0.05 (5 percent) are equivalent to a confidence level of 95 percent that the null hypothesis is correct. Alternatively stated, there is a 5 percent chance that the null hypothesis is incorrect, given the data being examined.

The hypotheses being tested in this thesis, Hypothesis I and II in figures 1.1 and 1.2 of Chapter I, are the alternative hypotheses to the null hypotheses that the means of the indicators being examined are equal before and after introduction of the minicomputers. Acceptance of the null hypothesis requires the rejection of the alternative hypothesis. Alternatively, rejection of the null hypothesis requires acceptance of the alternative hypothesis. [Ref. 23]

## 1. <u>Analysis</u>

Using the 84 cases refired above, an initial breakdown of CPM values, by type, presence of ADP, and location, reveals no obvious pattern in changes in CPM values, based on the presence of ADP. See Table 13 in the Appendix. There are however, apparent differences between types of projects, with paving projects having twice the mean CPM as do the other four types.

A threeway Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) of the dependent variable CPM using the factors ADP, LOC, and TYPE shows that the independent variable TYPE had a statistically significant influence on CPM, while LOC and ADP did not. Higher order interactions were suppressed due to empty cells. See Figure 3.4 below. Examination of the multiple classification analysis shows a marked difference in the deviations from the grand mean between paving and the other types of construction.

A multiple contrast of means was then developed to determine which pairs are statistically different at the 95 percent confidence level. Paving (Type 5) is statistically different from three of the types of vertical construction, however, those three types of vertical construction are not statistically different from each other, as shown in Table 5.

میں میں ایک اور		والمستجمع والمراجع والمراجع والمراجع والمناطر والمراجع والمراجع والمراجع والمراجع والمراجع والمراجع والمراجع والمراجع
000100 H * *	¥	LESSE I PAC
* * 2000000 00 · · · · ·	*	EAC EAC
* *H_00000	*	HANA HANA HIL
ά α α α α α α α α α α α α α	~~	
* * 30803 * *	ы. Н	
	ŝ	RH+Q
* *	X	
してますの人のするNA * *	ч	
2011の11日間本 *	A	
1300-1870 610 51870 710 51870	N	
	A	200 11100 000 EBO
Z *		00 mm/200 500 500
▲ *	N	
ま * まてこは1763	0	
24 <b>*</b> 17 <b>*</b> 20	H C	
• • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • •	-	I ST O
	~ 	0000 10000 FC
	н	NA ONOONO TEM EN
	Ĥ	DQ I I IIIMI I
1110 0110 0010 0010 0010 00100 001000	н	
SS 116 117 417 417 417 417 417 417 417 417 417	S	
	S	20 1300 500 x 200 1300 x 1300 x
ਨਸ਼* ਸ਼ੁਰੂਸ ਪੁਸ਼	A	
AV IVE	Ч	
	U	
		LI III
	Н	
ACTER ACTER	н 0	
	н	SY LED A
	F	
	Ţ.	C C C C C C C C C C C C C C C C C C C
부 · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	п	
	Σ	
	#	
HU OEX AO * *	*	AR AR COC
표스 러워퍼 포·· + *	*	

5

ANOVA on 84 CPM values, by Type, Location, and ADP. Figure 3.4

## TABLE 5

#### Comparison of CPM Means, by Type

(	CCMPARISONS AR	SIGNIFICAN E INDICATE	I AT THE O. I BY *****	05 LEVEL
TYPE COMPARIS	SIMULI LC CONFI DN LI	ANEOUS WER DIF DENCE B MIT	SIM FERENCE FTWEEN CO MEANS	ULTANEOUS UPPER NFIDENCE LIMIT
5 - 8	-4.	037 3	3.255	70.548
5 - 3	2.	207 3	3.408	64.610 ***
5 - 2	10.	257 3	8.597	66.937 ***
5 - 1	15.	352 4	1.637	67.922 ***
8 - 3	- 37	140	C. 153	37.446
8 - 2	- 29	593	5.341	40.275
8 - 1	- 24	907	E.381	41.670
$\begin{array}{c} 3 \\ 3 \\ 3 \end{array} \begin{array}{c} -2 \\ -1 \end{array}$	-23	152	5.188	33.529
	-18	056	8.228	34.513
2 - 1	- 19 .	775	3.040	25.855

Accordingly, project types were grouped into horizontal construction (TYPE 5 or paving) and vertical construction for further analysis. (TYPE 1, 2, 3, 8)This is consistent with the average CPM values for the various types of projects, noted in Table 13 cf Appendix B. Grouping of projects into horizontal and vertical construction is logical based on the trades involved and complexity cf work. The division of projects corresponds to the construction specialties of Buildings and Highways used by the Engineering News Record in annually categorizing the work of the top 400 construction contractors in the United States.

The factor LOC was reviewed further in an attempt to reduce the categories within the factor and hence the empty cells in the ANOVA matrix. Location categories were reduced from three to two with Diego Garcia listed separately because of the high operational priority assigned to jobs at that site, reflecting its strategic importance, and the other two sites, Puerto Fico and Rota, combined as otherwise normal deployment sites. A threeway ANOVA, shown in figure 3.5 was run on the recoded data. While TYPE was again the only factor that had a statistically discernable effect on CPM, two way interactions were also significant; specifically the interaction between TYPE and ADP. ADP failed to show a statistically significant effect on CPM.

2. Findings

Hypothesis I, restated below, was tested by determining the significance of the F statistic for the factor ADP in an ANOVA testing the null hypothesis that the mean values of CPM are equal for the different values of ADP.

In this analysis, after accounting for the influences of project type and location, the significance of F is 0.88, indicating a 88 percent probability of error if the null hypothesis is rejected. Accordingly, the null hypothesis cannot be rejected and the mean CPM values for the projects accomplished with and without minicomputer support are assumed to be equal. This in turn requires the rejection of Hypothesis I.

Hypothesis I: the dollar cost of material in place per direct labor manday is statistically different for construction projects accomplished since the introduction of minicomputers at the mainbody sites, than for those accomplished before their introduction.

_	_	_	_		_		
*		- EL EL C	30		0	0	
*	*	H O	000	0.04		.ŏ	
*	*	000	00	000			
*	*	Ś					
*	*	28	300	- 67 90 70	134 100	97	
*	*	<u>ы</u> т	300	0,0	-04	6	
*	*		50	000		5	
¥	*		_				
×	*	AH 2 H N H C H N H C	800	200 C	)	000	
*	*	ND O	3		ງເງເດ • • •		•
ы	*	00 00	000	0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0	120	120	0
U	¥	S S	2	5	5	50	רכ
N	*						
A	*						
н	*	ലന					~
24	*	ā, i		. ,.	•••	5	Ď
A	*						
٨	*						
	*	HN-	თ <del>ი</del>			0	2
í <b>n</b>	*	EA.	30	ñõŭ	ກ່າງ	031	ñ
0	*	200	000	0		о м и м	
	*	୰ୖୖୖ୰ୖ	ñğ Q	51	20	14 M	N N
S	*	-	-		-		SS.
н	*						IW
S	*						C.J
×	습*						ER.
	~ <b>*</b> *						S E
~~	ы. М						T)
2	н Н Н Н Н						222
~~ ¥		7					PH O
 ¥ □		Ĩ		NS			щo
<u></u> Ξ	≓ #	L		LO LO	0.0.		(a.)
*	8Х	RI			ADI		້
*	*	TS TS		R A(			ELE NO
*	*	ц Ц Ц		TEI		<b>_</b>	CA
*	*	0 F	сı,	NI	ല	AL	30
¥	+	E E E E E	5240	3 NO	SA	DO L	ຸຸ
*	*	N N N	-16-4	A N L	HH	-1H≤	4
¥	*	SO		2-1	l I	× ЧКГ	-

Figure 3.5 ANOVA USING RECODED FACTORS LOC, TYPE, ADP.

## D. CPH SENSITIVITY ANALYSIS

Analysis of any type presupposes a certain degree of accuracy in the data analyzed. The degree of accuracy readily obtained, and the degree of accuracy required are both difficult to determine a priori. Sensitivity analysis is an accepted technique for dealing with the accuracy question and its effect on the outcome of the analysis. The basic procedure is to determine the degree to which data critical to the analysis can vary before changing the outcome of the analysis. [Ref. 24].

Four variables were included in the final analysis of The sensitivity analysis that follows will Hypothesis I. focus on the development of the CPM values. TYPE, LCC, and ADP were excluded from the sensitivity analysis because the initial data refinement excluded projects where there was any question as to the validity of the values of these data elements, as indicated by the CONF factor assigned. The basic question which will be addressed is the accuracy required in deflating project cost figures to constant The Engineering News Record January Material Cost dollars. Index, 20 City National Average was used, with a necessary simplifying assumption that all costs were incurred on the start date of the projects. Treatment of cost inflation is a critical issue because of the 88 percent increase in the material cost index over the seven year period covered by the analysis (an average annual rate of 9.5 percent), and the fact that the minicomputers were introduced in the middle of that inflationary period.

Various average rates of inflation were used to determine at what point it would reduce the prob. value for ADP to 0.05 in the analysis of variance. That average annual rate was determined to be 2 percent, as compared to the average annual rate of 9.5 percent determined from the ENR index.

Some variation between the actual average inflation rate and that provided by the ENR 20 city national average is expected due to the difference in procurement practices between the federal government and that used to develop the index. It is reasonable to assume though that such an extreme downward bias is not probable.

## IV. LEVEL OF EFFORT AS A FRODUCTIVITY INDICATOR

#### A. INTRODUCTION

The preceding chapter evaluated the more traditional labor productivity indicator, that of the cost of construction in place per direct labor manday. The second area of analysis is that of percent direct labor, which is a level of effort index more than a productivity index. It is an index that is used and commonly accepted within the NCF. The hypothesis to be tested is stated below, followed by a section discussing the use of percent direct labor as a performance measure and a review of the available data. Sections on the analysis, findings, and sensitivity analysis conclude the chapter.

Hypothesis II: the percent direct labor experienced by NMCBs since the introduction of minicomputers at mainbody deployment sites is statistically different than that experienced prior to their introduction.

#### B. PERCENT DIRECT LABOR AS A PERFORMANCE MEASURE

Direct labor hours expended on a deployment and the resultant percent direct labor rate are aspects of battalion performance that receive high visibility both within the battalion and from its operational senior, the regiment. This is partially because construction project tasking is based to a large extent on the projected available manhours of direct labor. Available manhours of direct labor are a function of the expected direct labor rate (normally 20-25 percent for the main body of the battalion), the projected average on-board count of personnel, and the number of workdays in the deployment.

Monthly deployment status reports provide estimated percent complete information on all projects. The reports are based on labor requirements for the project and are normally taken as the mandays of labor expended over the required mandays estimated for the project. Assuming that projects are completed in the estimated mandays, a graph of actual and projected cumulative mandays versus months of deployment, such as that shown in Figure 4.1, would provide an accurate measure of tasking accomplishment. In fact. а second vertical scale could be percent tasking completed, if the tasking was not changed during deployment, i.e., no projects added/deleted (an unlikely occurance), and manday requirements for original projects remain constant (a highly unlikely occurance).

If manning remained constant and cumulative mandays fell below the straight line, overall performance would, in lieu of extenuating circumstances such as adverse weather, material or equipment delays, military operations, or a change in priorities/tasking, te judged below par. If the cumulative manday figure was above the straight line, performance would be above par. Unfortunately, there is no clear distinction made between mandays required for a project and the total mandays expended on it. The two have generally been taken to be the same. It is worth noting that the Commander, Naval Mobile Construction Battalions, Atlantic Fleet instruction on timekeeping procedures did not have a cost account for rework [Ref. 25]. Similar timekeeping procedures in effect were in the Pacific. Accordingly, any rework required on a project due to unsatisfactory material or workmanship, or any other cause, gets





incorporated into total project manday and material cost figures, with no data available for distinguishing those costs. The difference considered in terms of total cost would be a valid measure of labor productivity.

A measure that allows for the variance in manning is the percentage direct labor figure. Assuming that projects were being completed within the direct labor manday budget allotted, the direct labor percentage measures the level of effort expended towards completion of tasking. See figure 4.2. If the percentage direct labor equals that used in the original tasking and average manning had been properly forecasted when the tasking was assigned, averaging that percent direct labor rate throughout the deployment would result in the 100 percent completion of the tasking. Specifically, the percent attainment of the planned cumulative percent direct labor rate would equal the percent of tasking It is easy to understand why percent direct completed. labor figures are closely monitcred. They provide a single figure to monitor, which should vary little between battalions or deployments. Unlike tasked manday figures, it is relatively independent of specific manning levels, as long as that level remains unchanged. It does not require involved evaluation of progress on each job. If 24 percent direct labor is the goal and that is achieved, it is not unreasonable to expect that the tasking will have basically been completed. It must be recognized however, that some projects would have progressed further than planned; others correspondingly less.

The principle drawbacks on the use of percent direct labor are that (1) it is a measure of level of effort, not of accomplishment, (2) it de-emphasizes productivity by assuming it is both constant and correctly projected when original manday estimates were developed, and (3) there is no effective check inherent in its use which works to insure

Actual Cumulative Percent Direct Labor Percent Tasking -----Flanned Percent Direct Tabor = Completed Example: 18% Direct Labor Attained ---------------------------------= = 75% of Tasking Completed

Figure 4.2 Percent Direct Labor/Tasking Completion.

proper labor classification. In fact, the attention given to percent direct labor figures would tend to insure that they are reported as high as possible. The performance measures used affect the reward system, which is intended to affect performance. The result which normally occurs is that the performance measure becomes performance per se, and efforts tend to be directed towards achieving good performance measures instead of good performance. [Ref. 26] Simply stated, the desired performance is completion of tasking, not attainment of high percent direct labor figures. The project supervisor is responsible for project accomplishment, but because of difficulties inherent in adjusting the required manday estimate on a project, it is often difficult to accurately gauge percentage complete. Minimally it requires an updating of the Critical Path Method (CPM) project management system. Time cards, however, are submitted weekly and provide immediate feedback on the level of effort (percent direct labor) being expended. As such, the system encourages that time be charged to direct labor, and net to indirect or overhead functions, in order to report good performance measures.

Despite its inherent limitations, percent direct labor is an established and accepted indicator of battalion

performance, with its limitations recognized within the NCF. Deployment data was analyzed accordingly in an effort to detect changes in percentage direct labor associated with the introduction of computer assisted construction management.

## C. DATA ELEMENTS USED IN THE ANALYSIS

## 1. <u>Overview</u>

The primary sources of data for this portion of the analysis were the deployment completion reports (ECRs) completed by each battalion following the end of the deployment. The five year period 1977-1981 at the five mainbcdy deployment sites represented a total of 42 deployments by the 8 NMCBs. Forty of the DCRs were available for analysis.

The requirements for the preparation and submission of Deployment Completion Reports are delineated in a joint COMCBFAC/LANT instruction [Ref. 27]. It states in part "The Deployment Completion Report constitutes the primary single source of historical information with regard to battalion accomplishments and lessons learned on deployment." The instruction includes a standard format, topic areas and formated tables for statistical information on various aspects of the deployment, both personnel and project related. Despite the standardized guidance on preparation of the DCRs, one or more items of key information scught for this aralysis could not be found in 70 percent of the forty DCRs reviewed.

Each deployment comprises one case. The ten variables compiled for the analysis are listed below, followed by an explanation of their derivation. The data values for the forty-two cases are listed in Appendix C. The variable BTNCODE identifies each case as to battalion, deployment site, and consecutive deployment at the site since the start

of the study. Tables 14 and 15 in Appendix C provides a breakdown of the factors  $assign \epsilon d$ .

Dependent Variable

MBACTDL Mainbody actual percent direct labor.

Independent Variables

- MBEM Average mainbody enlisted personnel.
- CONDUCT A factor that incorporates both awards given and disciplinary action taken during deployment.
- COTIBTN Commanding Officer time in battalion.
- MO%INT Percent Interium Repairs on the battalion's allowance of vehicles and heavy construction equipment.
- WTAVETOF Weighted average turnover factor of personnel.
- COMPUTER Computer availability: 0 for deployments at sites prior to introduction of the minicomputer, and 1 for subsequent deployments.
- LOC Location of the deployment site:
  - Puerto Rico
     Rota, Spain
     Okinawa, Japan
     Guam
     Diego Garcia.
- DLPERS Average mainbody personnel assigned to direct labor.
- %LOSTDAY lost workdays as a percent of total workdays.

# 2. Dependent Variable, MBACTDL

As addressed above, percent direct labor has been chosen as the dependent variable, in an attempt to determine if a statistical relationship can be identified between it and ADP. While percent direct labor data is available for the whole battalion, as well as the just the mainbody, the analysis is restricted to the mainbody because the majority of other data is available for the mainbody.

3. Independent Variables

a. MBEM

The total average onboard count of enlisted personnel at the mainbody site. This figure is available directly from the DCR.

b. Conduct

The DCR requires information on both the number of awards (medals, letters of commendation by higher authority (SLOC), and command letters of commendation (CLOC)) and the number of disciplinary cases (court martials (CM), and nonjudicial punishment (NJP)). These five data elements were combined as shown in figure 4.3.

> > Figure 4.3 Conduct.

The factors are comparable between battalions of different on-board strengths, because each of the terms should be divided by the battalion strength, and that 1/battalion strength term cancels out of both the numerator and the denominator. The weighting factors provide relatively greater weights to the medal, SLOC and CM occurances.

This factor is utilized to take account of both the disruptive influence and the positive influence of those whose performance warrants special attention. Both are felt to influence productive effort. Larger values of CONDUCT indicate a relatively greater overall positive influence during a deployment.

c. COTIBTN

While it is not possible to utilize traditional learning curve techniques to account for the increasing contribution towards production that is expected to come from time in key billets, some recognition of that influence is possible through inclusion of a time in battalion factor for the Commanding Officer (COTIBTN). This factor equals the average current battalion experience by the individual in that billet. For a CO reporting aboard at the beginning of a 9 month deployment, COTIBTN = 4.5. For a CO completing a 24 month tour, being relieved at the end of the third month of a 9 month deployment, COTIBTN is figured as follows:

 $((3/9) \times (21 + 24)/2) + ((6/9) \times (0 + 6)/2) = 9.5$ See figure 4.4. The Civil Engineer Corps Directory, NavFac P-1,. provided reporting dates for all officers.

d. MO%INT

This indicator is derived from the average of the interium repairs performed  $\epsilon$  ach month as a percentage of



Figure 4.4 Derivation of COTIBTN.

the average CESE in service each month during the deployment. CESE is an acronym for Civil Engineer Support Equipment. It includes all vehicles and major construction equipment assigned to the battalion, excluding tools and minor equipment that is managed by the central tool room. Typical examples of CESE are jeeps, dump trucks, motor graders, backhoes, and wheeled cr tracked tractors. A relatively higher MO%INT figure will have a more disruptive influence on production, as vehicles and/or equipment are out of service for unscheduled repairs. The information for this data element is taken from the DCR.

e. WTAVETOF

Personnel stability statistics are a required part of the DCR. Information is provided on losses and gains, by month of deployment, for the following categories: officers, E-7 to E-9, E-5 to E-6, E-1 to E-4. The WIAVETOF was computed as shown in figure 4.5.

Standard battalion peacetime manning for enlisted personnel by rate and rating, was obtained from reference 4. Enlisted tour lengths are available in the Enlisted Transfer Manual, reference 28. They range from 36 The most predominate sea tour is 36 months: to 48 months. this was taken as the standard, in computing the WTAVETOFS. Officer tour lengths have been a standard 24 aonths throughout the period of this study.

The turnover factor should equal 1.00; a greater number indicates higher than average turnover. This factor was included to provide recognition to the varying extent of turnover within different battalions, and to allow for recognition of its possible influence on production. Note that no allowance is made here for the relative influence of the different categories, i.e. a 110 percent WTAVETOF for chiefs (E-7 to E-9) would have the same value as a 110 percent WTAVETOF for junior enlisted personnel (E-1 to E-4).

Terms	Jatual Transform (in an aut) Junia
ATII	deployment.
TMA	Average Monthly Transfers. Calculated by multiplying the allowance of the category by 2 (transfer in and out) and dividing by the average tour length in months.
ETfr	Expected Transfers during deployment. This equals the AMT times the months of deployment
IOF	ATTI/EITT (Actual over Expected Transfers, during deployment)
For each E5-E6, an a weighte weighting	of the four categcries (officer, chiefs, ad E1-E4) the TOF is calculated and then ed average (WTAVETCF) is determined by geach category according to its proportion

Figure 4.5 Weighted Average Turnover Factor.

f. COMPUTER

Installation/initial operational dates for the minicomputer at each site were obtained the narrative portion of the applicable DCRs and confirmed with records at CESO. A dummy, categorical variable (0,1) was assigned based on the absence cr presence respectively, of the minicomputer. Table 1 in Chapter Three shows installation dates for each site.

D. PERCENT DIRECT LABOR, ANALYSIS AND FINDINGS

1. <u>Analysis</u>

An analysis of variance using SPSS was performed on MBACTDL, with COMPUTER and LOC as factors, and COTIBIN, WTAVETOF, and MBEM as covariates. The three covariates were chosen from the possible seven because they provided a reasonable match between a need to include variables

representative of the differences between deployments, and a desire to maximize the number of cases utilized in the analysis. (As noted above, 70 percent of the forty cases studied had missing data for one or more of the eleven variables.) The analysis of variance procedure deletes cases if any of the variables are missing.

This initial ANOVA revealed that both LOC and MBEM had a statistically significant effect on MBACTDL. In addition there was a significant two way interaction between COMPUTER and LOC, as shown in Figure 4.6 below.

A separate analysis of variance was then performed on MBACTDL, with COMPUTER as a factor and the same covariates (COTIBEN, WTAVETOF, and MBEM) on the Diego Gracia deployments, on Okinawa deployments, and on deployments at the remaining sites as a group. This grouping of deployment sites follows the logic presented in the analysis of CPM in previous chapter. the Okinawa was treated separately because cnly one battalion, NMCB 3 (split into a Blue and a Gold team) rotated deployments there. This provided a greatly enhanced degree of continuity over that normally Guam was included with Rota, Spain and Puerto expected. Rico as an otherwise normal deployment site. Diego Garcia treated separately because of the high operational was priority placed on projects there. The results are shown in figures 4.7 through 4.9; in each case COMPUTER has a statistically significant effect on the MBACTDL rate achieved on the deployment, (i.e. significance of F of .05 or less.)
K    S    I	A S S I F I C A T I O N A N A L Y S I S * * *      N    UNADJUSTED FOR INDEPENDENTS      N    DEV'N ETA DEV'N BETA DEV'N BETA FOR INDEPENDENTS      14    -0.58      17    0.48      0.09    0.01      0.161    0.01      0.61    0.61      0.61    0.65      0.61    0.61
<pre>* * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * *</pre>	* * * M U L T I P L E C L A S S I F GRAND MEAN = 23.10 VARIABLE + CATEGORY CCMPUTER + CATEGORY CCMPUTER + CATEGORY 14 17 14 14 17 10 1 ADP 1 ADD 1 ADDD 1 ADD 1 AD

ANOVA, WITH ALL LOCATIONS FACTORED SEPERATELY **Pigure 4.6** 

• .

1

المتناك والمسودية أشفاء ويهرد بهاد وتعاول والمتعونين بالبارد بتبي أشاك ويتارك فالمتعوية فأ		والاحة ميله يتحدين المحال
* * \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$	*	ANNA NH-
0000100 H	*	
90 · · · · ·	*	
* *H 00000	¥	
* * *		AF
本 本 0mm=0m05 広のの一千の0	01	
	н	
* *	S	
* *	54	
Multi Seau Jues	-	ແນຟ ພວອ
* * れようてつくてうつらう ほんらうろうりょうこう	Ч	5722 HHO 225: HHO
* * 20 • • • • • • •	A	HA O.
80001m00000 0000 + 0000 + F	22	
		HA .
U #	A	58+ 80 70 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0
X *		
K *	Z	AND IN AND
	_	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·
きょうしょう ほう しょうしょう ほう しょうしょう	Q	
	1-1	AL E
<b>*</b>	ы	
	_	SL 0
- U* H	P <b>C</b> 7	<b>DN 6</b> 2
日本にとりてのののすりの	υ	0- 8ú
H A* MWWWWWWWW	н	
	<b>TT</b> _1	
O UFLAW FNON		
	н	
សងម្មារ ស្រុ	S	
	S	22 00
고 고 고 고 고 고 고 고 고 고 고 고 고 고 고 고 고 고 고	- 4	
また) E1 の中の米	A	
×0*	ч	
	U	
XH S	-	
ыны <b>ж ОО</b>		
ຂູ * ມີບັນ	63	
	н	7
	<u>.</u>	L
ли <u>а</u> йн С <u>к</u>		- 1- 0
- 2013 日本王 本王 R - 21 - 22 - 22 - 23 - 23 - 23 - 23 - 23	н	2 0 7
* * * 1000 H-	E-I	BC BC
		AT 2U
	H	S C I
	D	
* * ""	Σ	
		N JONG NA
HAZHERHD V		
HUMBLOO A * *	Ŧ	
* * <b>DH</b> ANE	¥	ILI CHE
* * VII 111111	*	U PU 22

• • •

.

ANOVA For Puerto Rico, Rota, and Guam Deployments. Figure 4.7

· · · .

٠.

..

.

•

71

.

٠.-

A    L    Y    S    0    F    V    A    R    I    A    *
A    L    Y    S    O    F    V    A    R    I    A    K    *
A    L    Y    S    V    A    R    I    A    K    *
A    L    Y    S    O    F    V    A    R    I    A    K
A    L    Y    S    V    A    R    I    A    K    I    I    K    I    K    I    K    I    K    I    K    I    K    I    K    I    K    I    K    I    K    I    K    I    K    I    K    I    K    I    K
A    L    Y    A    R    I    A    C    E    *
A    L    Y    S    O    F    V    A    R    I    A    K
A    L    Y    S    O    F    V    A    R    I    A    K
A    L    Y    S    O    F    V    A    R    I    N    C    K    *
A    L    Y    S    O    F    V    A    R    I    A    K    I    K    I    K    I    K    I    K    I    K    I    K    I    K
A    L    Y    A    R    I    A    C    K    V    A    R    I    A    K
A L Y S I S BY COMPUTER HITH COTIERN, WTAVETOF MBEM HITH COTIERN, WTAVETOF MBEM SUM OF SouthES S99-591 24:107 5:949 5:949 5:949 5:949 5:949 5:949 5:949 5:949 5:949 5:949 5:949 5:949 5:949 5:949 107 5:947 107 107 107 107 107 107 107 107 107 10
A L Y S I S BY COMPUTER HITH COTIBIN, WTAVETOF, MBEM + + + + + + + + + + + + + + + + + + +
A    L    Y    A    R    I    A    N    C    K    *
A    L    Y    A    R    I    A    N    C    E    *
A L Y S I S BY COMPUTER HITH COTIBTN, WTAVETOF, MBEM * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * *
A L Y S I S BY COMPUTER HITH COTIBTN, WTAVETOF, MBEM + + + + + + + + + + + + + + + + + + +
A L Y S I S BY COMPUTER HITH COTIBIN, WTAVETOF MBEM S UNAFES 5004RES 5004RES 5004RES 3005 * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * *
A L Y S I S BY COMPUTER HITH COTIBIN, WTAVETOF, MBEM S UN OF S
A L Y S I S BY COMPUTER HITH COTIBIN, WTAVETOF A R I A N HITH COTIBIN, WTAVETOF A BEA S SUBRES S S UBRES S S UBRES S S E U S S E D S S S S E D S S S S S E D S S S S E D S S S S S E D S S S S S S S E D S S S S S S S S S S S S S S S S S S S
A L Y S I S BY COMPUTER #ITH COTIBIN, WTAVETOF, MBEM * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * *
A L Y S I S BY COMPUTER HITH COTIBIN, WTAVETOF, MBEM SUBRES SUBRE
A L Y S I S BY COMPUTER HITH COTIBEN FITH COTIBEN SUM FOF SUM FER SUM
A L Y S I S BY COMPUTER HITH COTIBIN, WTAVETOF M HITH COTIBIN, WTAVETOF M S 00 0 B F S 00 0 F S 00 0 F S 00 0 F S 0 0 F
A L Y S I S BY COMPUTER HITH COTIBIN, WTAVETOF HITH COTIBIN, WTAVETOF SSUDARS SSUDARS SSED. SSED. SSED. SSED. C L A S S I F I C A T C L A S S I F I C A T C L A S S I F I C A T UNADJUSTE N DEV'N BET 0.7
A L Y S I S BY COMPUTER HITH COTIBTN, WTAVETOF HITH COTIBTN, WTAVETOF S SUMARS S SUMARS S SUMARS S S S S S S S S S S S S S S S S S S S
A L Y S I S BY COMPUTER HITH COTIERN HITH COTIERN SSED SSED C L A S S I F I C A C L A S S I F I C A C L A S S I F I C A UNADJUS N DEV'N DEV'N
A L Y COMPUTER BY LCOMPUTER #ITH COTTERN # # # # # # # # # # # # # # # # # # #
A L Y COMPUTER HITH COPUTER HITH COTTER HITH COTTER HITH COTTER HITH COTTER HITH COTTER HITH COTTER HITH COTTER HITH COTTER SSEU HITH COTTER HITH COTT
ALLYCOMPUTERS BYLCOMPUTERS ATTHACOPUTERS ************************************
ALLYCOMPUTERS BYLCOMPUTERS ATTHCOPUTERS COTTBER SSUUM SSUUM CLASSICUM CLASSICUM CLASSICUM CLASSICUM CLASSICUM CLASSICUM CLASSICUM CLASSICUM CLASSICUM CLASSICUM
ALLAN CASTANA BALLOADTRS ALLAN ALLAN ALLAN ALLAN ALLAN SSIN CLAN SSIN CLAN SSIN ALLAN SS
A L C Y S L S H C Y S L S H L C Y S L S H L C Y S S H L S S S H L
A L C L A A L C L A A L C L A A L C L A A L C L C
이 변 이 변 이 변 이 변 이 변 이 변 이 변 이 변 이 변 이 변
۲.۵× ۲.۵× ۲.۵×
A A A CON CON A CON
$\begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$
$\begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$

Figure 4.8 ANOVA, for Okinawa Deployments

72

د این در از مانور و بروانی از می داده بروانی این می وارد روانی از می <mark>این این این ا</mark> ین اور ا	<b>پ</b> ەر يەك <sup>ى</sup> يەممىيە <sup>ي</sup> ىلەر بەت يەمەي بەتبە بىرى كەتبى بەتبەر يەر تەكەپ
* *24707707	* AZHA .00
ů v	AZE
	Elect on
* * OUO0-0	5 DEC 30
HO00-30	
້ ດີທີ່ສຳດັດ	
N * *	S
* *	Х
と見てはつらつてつのの	HEN ASH
	BOO ENT
* * 20	
A thom show the	
	<u>е</u> ны
Q *	A 244 PM 08
2 *	
H AX 00 Baterration	0
K 27 A	H AN N
	비는 00   고 도망 · ·
E4	
	A DI VE
む* よろちょうらうちゅう	U Q. 000
	ξ <del>ε</del> ι (
	ні
	10
	01
	N Z NU
NHO*	<b>~</b>
<b>EO</b> EI	
	н
비 문 문	U I
E1E1	
*_ * <u> </u>	ы ы
<b>▲Č * Ř</b>	7 6
OH MAN O	6 EE 1
* E * H * E * E * E * E * E * E * E * E	H N O H
* * * 100 H	AI E I
4 <b>4</b> 0 Hu	S P C = ]
* * >HH H VV	
202200 44 * * * * * * * * * *	
OFDUR HT	
ADEPARA DO	
~ ~ ~ ~ 뜨뎌는	

Ĵ

Pigure 4.9 ANOVA, for Diego Garcia Deployments.

.....

### 2. <u>Findings</u>

Hypothesis II, restated below, is tested similarly to Hypothesis I by determining the significance of the F statistic of the factor COMPUTEF in an analysis of variance that includes available and likely factors and covariates which might affect the dependent variable percent direct labor (MBACTDL). Hypothesis II is conversely related to the null hypothesis that the mean values of percent direct labor are equal, for deployments before and after the introduction of the minicomputers.

Hypothesis II: the percent direct labor experienced by NMCBs since the introduction of minicomputers at mainbcdy deployment sites is statistically different than that experienced prior to their introduction.

Within the deployment groupings developed, the null hypothesis is safely rejected with less than five percent probability of being in error. Accordingly, Hypothesis II is accepted, with a 95 percent level of confidence.

The multiple classification analysis section that follows each analysis of variance shows the effect of the factor CCMPUTER on the grand mean of the dependent variable, MBACTEL. In the case of Diege Garcia deployments, after adjusting for the independent factor and the covariates, MBACTEL figures averaged 23.14 (29.57 - 6.43) before introduction of the computer and 32.14 (29.57 + 2.57) after introduction of the computers, with an R squared value of 0.948. Percent direct labor figures for Okinawa deployments likewise went from an adjusted average of 18.7 to 21.41 with the introduction of the computer. (R squared = 0.969). The analysis which grouped Puerto Fico, Guam and Rota, Spain

together shows a decrease in the adjusted average percent direct labor, from 23.52 percent to 20.22 percent. This however has a much lower R squared value of 0.464.

### E. PERCENT DIRECT LABOR SENSITIVITY ANALYSIS

In the above analysis, the main variable of concern is that of percent direct labor. It was noted that rework was reported as direct labor and that the reward system tended to emphasize attainment of high percent direct labor figures on monthly deployment status reports. The sensitivity analysis addresses how much error in the percent direct labor figures can be accommodated before the results of the analysis would change (i.e. significance of the F statistic for COMPUTER exceed 0.05)?

There are no apparent factors which would tend to bias the percent direct labor figures upward since the introduction of the computer. If anything, the tendency would be the opposite, as mandays must now be reported against specific activities on the project and reports are readily available showing actual versus planned mandays by activity. Increased use of these reports within the battalion would modify the reward system by giving the battalion chain of command weekly (or more frequently, if desired) reports on actual versus planned performance. This puts the crew leader in a position of having to justify overbudget expenditure of labor on each activity on a weekly basis. Before, with the practice of equating project percent complete with percent project mandays expended, the battalion basically had to reconcile the two only at the end of the deployment during turnover to the next battalion, assuming the project was not completed or there was a significant amount of mandays left out of the planned total requirement.

The question remains; how much error in the percent direct labor figures can be accommodated without affecting the analysis results? To determine this, the percent direct labor figures for deployments prior to introduction of the computer were changed by various percentages until the significance of the F statistic for the factor computer Those percentages were 7 percent for Diego reached 0.05. Garcia, 6 percent for Okinawa, and minus 4 percent for the otherwise normal deployment sites of Guam, Puerto Rico, and (Recall that in the Multiple Classification Analysis Rota. associated with the last ANOVA, introduction of the computer showed a decrease in percent direct labor figures.)

For Okinawa, if percent direct labor figures for the deployments prior to the introduction of the computer were all actually 6 percent higher than those reported (i.e. MBACTEL reported as 20 percent where the correct figure was 21.2 percent), the analysis would have shown a significance of F of .051 and Hypothesis II would have been rejected.

These variances are, in the opinion of the author, certainly within the realm of possibility, but given the natural bias upward before the introduction of the computer and downward after its introduction, they are not probable in the case of the Okinawa and the Diego Garcia deployments. In the case of the Puerto Ricc, Rota, Guam group, if a reported average 23.5 percent direct labor figure for deployments prior to the introduction of minicomputers were actually 22.6 percent (i.e., the reported figures were 4 percent greater that actual figures), then an analysis using the correct figures would have shown no statistically discernable effect. Given the aforementioned natural tiases, this is well within the realm of probability.

### V. CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

### A. CCST PER MANDAY

1

### 1. <u>Conclusions</u>

The analysis of cost per manday as a productivity measure revealed no statistically discernable difference in cost per manday figures before and after introduction of the minicomputers, with the results relatively insensitive to the inflation rate used to deflate the cost figures to constant dollars. The premise in the initial Automated Data System Development Plan, that a fifteen percent reduction in construction durations would occur as a result of introduction of the minicomputers, was untestable due to a lack of recorded data on initial construction schedules.

The final analysis showed a statistically significant two way interaction between ADP and the recoded factor TYPE. A review of the available information fails to disclose any explanation for this interaction. The correlation of ADP with time may introduce a factor that is not properly accounted for in the analysis, possibly due to the method of deflating costs, an uridentified change in the mix of projects. or changes in battalion operational or construction procedures. An indepth focus on time correlated changes within the battalions might have resulted in the identification cf an additional factor or factors which could have aided in the analysis of the effect of ADP on CPM. Such a focus was not within the scope of this study.

It must be recognized that CPM is not presented as an accepted, established, or validated productivity indicator. In fact, this is recognized as an inherent weakness in studying the effect of minicomputers or any other

management techniques in battalions; there is no generally accepted productivity index in use within the Naval Construction Force. It is noted however that this is not inconsistent with public sector construction in general. Both construction and public sector work, in general, have been outside the mainstream of productivity analysis due to difficulties in measuring output and determining comparable projects for comparison purposes.

### 2. <u>Recommendations</u>

An alternative approach to a typical productivity study could consider the standard in private sector construction, i.e., bringing the project in within the bid amount. Conceptually, projects could have a bid price established, including equipment and direct labor costs, at the start of the project and any changes to that price would be negotiated with the ROICC using established contract negotiation procedures. This would correspond closely to output as determined in the private sector, costed in Performance would then be measured based upon the dollars. inputs used to complete the project. Project management software is readily available for tracking this information against budgeted amounts. Whether this procedure would warrant the time and effort associated with it is uncertain. However the lack of an established, objective procedure to measure performance hampers the improvement of construction productivity, which is an important concern within the NCF.

### B. PERCENT DIRECT LABOR

### 1. <u>Conclusions</u>

The conclusion of this analysis is that the introduction of minicomputers did have a statistically significant effect on the percent direct labor obtained on

deployment. An increase in percent direct labor was expected, and demonstrated at Diego Garcia and Okinawa, however the decrease found at the remaining sites is unexplained. The findings for the Fuerto Rico, Rota, Guam group are sensitive to the accuracy of the percent direct labor figures reported to the extent that it is not felt that the findings should be considered conclusive. The time correlation of the introduction of the minicomputers, coupled with the lack of a control group makes it difficult to determine whether extraneous factors account for these differences. A more indepth focus on concurrent changes in operational and construction procedures might result in the identification of these factors, but none were apparent in the course of the study.

### 2. <u>Recommendations</u>

Considerations for further analysis should include a time series analysis of the three general categories of labor (direct, indirect, and overhead), coupled with a thorough evaluation of the extent of minicomputer use by major software application. The presence or absence of the computer, as used in this analysis, may have been an oversimplification given the varying degrees to which it may have been used.

### C. SUMMARY

While this analysis has not been able to substantiate that minicomputers have had a significant effect on the productivity measure developed, a change in percent direct labor was shown. It is entirely plausible (if not probable) that the inability to show a statistically significant effect of minicomputers on productivity reflects more the inadequacy of the productivity index developed than the lack

of effect of the minicomputers. Further research is recommended in the development of an objective productivity index, even if it is project specific, to provide a more objective measure of construction project performance to the battalion. Realistic, quantifiable goals are critical to improving performance and sustaining that improvement. The magnitude of the construction put in place each year by the NCF warrants additional research in this area.

The question of the applicability of minicomputers to the mission of the NCF may be viewed as purely academic within the next decade, as their availability and capabilities increase and costs continue to drop. While this analysis treated computer availability as a binary factor, the state of the art in computer hardware and software tends to improve continuously. with relative differences between successive generations of equipment perhaps more significant than the presence/absence factor used here. Future studies should focus on productivity issues, the control and programming of labor and nonlabor resources, and the ability of the battalions to accurately plan and execute those plans, completing projects on schedule and within budget.

Construction Productivity Data

1		

(Note: '\*' indicates case used in final analysis.)

DEFL ATOR	0.807419	0.757974	0.757974	0.798733	0.773767	0.562713	0.694711	0.687780	0.523080	0.675273	0.757974	0.542173	0.721173	0.687780	0.589511	0.657342	442U8C.U
CPM LOC	54.15 1. 90.35 1.	72.44 1. 28.01 1.	11.45 1.	44 65 1	27.83 1.	26.12.1.		7.67 1.	35.26 1.		21.83 1.	17.23 1.	25.75 1.	22.55 1.	19.78 1.	30.91 1.	-1 - 1 - 1
NF ADJ\$	13590. 61165.	122294.	8016. 53682	145830.	717890.	8306	2027	6577.	34592.	14 108.3	78660.	9289	8136	7759.	6743.	4429.	•CC/0
ADP TYPE CO	1. 0. 0.	1. 3. 0.		1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1	1.1.0.			1.0.4	5. 2. 0.		1. 5. 0.	دى. • 0•		1. 2. 0.	5.1.0.	1. 2.	5. U. U.
INDEX	1030.195	1097.398 1097.398	1097.398	104 1. 398	1075.000	1478.195	1411.195.195	1205.398	1590.195	797 1231	1097.398	1534.195	1153_398	1209.398	1411.000	1265.398	1433.J 438
START	76.6	77.2	77.2	76.7	77.0	80 <b>.</b> 0	78.1	78.2	81-6 81-6	78 • 6 78 • 4	77.2			78.2	80.0	78.7	80.2
COST	16832. 79048.	132845.	10576.	182576 u7880	927772.	14760-	13833	9562.	66132.	21212.	103776.	17 132 -	11282	11281.	11439.	6738	11040.
MANDAY	251.	1390. 4366.	700.	3266	25794.	318.	-075	857.	981.	507. 145.	3603.	• • • • • • • • • • • • • •	316	344	341.	120	320.
PROJECT	1517.	* 1577. * 1582.	1587. * 1588	* 00.9	* 469.	* 6401.	* # # 02°	408.	* 411.	+ 416.	* 801.	7401.	404	* 407	* 408°		• t

CONSTRUCTION PRODUCTIVITY DATA

Ď

Construction Productivity Data (cont'd.)

DEFL ATOR	0.5057342 0.5057342 0.505286 0.634867	0.700758 0.681469 0.645909	0.558480 0.523080 0.523080	0.580299 0.580299 0.651576	0.589511 0.538243	0.534370 0.534370 0.624194	0.546159	0.523080 0.523080 0.580299	0.728247	0.580299 0.580299	0.781916	0.728247	0.790235	0.538243 0.728247
LOC						• • • •		~	200	201	200	202	200	20
CPM	15.38 7.66 31.96 16.07		760 10	18.59 78.92 16.28	52.77	34 03 96 57	30.92	14-13	16 43		27-96	25.70	3.29	30-00 8-23
NF ADJ\$	1138. 23650. 6670.	89733. 15435. 12916.	48081. 11943. 5215.	2/1082. 60373. 16276.	30086.	60226. 132295. 31545.	44112. 41160.	7296. 11543. 35188.	159302. 38402.	9076. 18697. 27111.	24439. 35321.	361964.	3200. 4547.	32607. 13896.
บั เม	0000	0000	000	040	000	000	0.30		40	003	300		000	40
IYPI	0-00	5000	••••	- 00-	2	- - -	500	<b></b>	- - -	- ~ ~ ~		•	••••	1.
ADP	•••••	• • • • م) • • • • •	ດ້ເດົ້າຕໍ່	ມ ເມ	ທີ່ທໍາ	ກ. ການເກັ	က်က်း	ົ້າຕໍ່ເ	n N	- • • - • •	, , , , , ,	-01-	<u>.</u>	- - -
INDEX	1265.398 187.000 1646.195 1310.195	187.000 1220.598 1287.797	1489.398 1489.398	1321.398 1433.398 1276.598	1411-000 1545-398	1489.398 1556.598 1332.598	523.000	1590.195 1590.195 1433.398	142.195	1063-797 1433-398 1467-000	1388.598 1063.797	142.195	1052-598 1063-797	142.195
START	78-7 792-10-12-12-12-12-12-12-12-12-12-12-12-12-12-	0000	20-90 00-10	780 80 780 780	80 80 80 80 80		880	200 80 80 80	118	200 000 000 000	860 60 7		76.8	81.2 77.6
COST	1731- 5725- 46806- 10506-	128051 22649 19996	21385 21385	430642 104038 24979	51036.	10/839- 247572- 50537-	80768 75363	13949 22067 60637	218747.	32219. 47815	45172	497035	58150	60580. 19082
MANDAY	524 740	2228 1040		14583. 765.	1315.	1370-2324-	1528.	817. 2058.	9697. 1417.	1489.	1306	14082	-050 -070 -070 -070 -070 -070 -070 -070	1087.
PROJECT	** #12. ** #17. 8#23.	8003 8003 8004 8004 8004 8004 8004 8004	* * *	* 815. 816.	* 822 822 *	* * 823 825 * *	* 843	* 1465. *69880. * 105.	110.	* 116. * 116.	* *		* 446	* 450.

Construction Productivity Data (cont'd.)

DEFL ATOR	0.5567007 0.5567007 0.5567007 0.526789 0.526789 0.526789	0.580299 0.580299 0.721173 0.721173	0.613874 0.613874 0.687780 0.687780	0.5571371 0.5571371 0.5577007 0.526789	0.526789 0.5861599 0.50187159	0.534370
roc	NNNNNNN MO-FMOM	2000000	100000 100000	2020824	10000 C	101 <b>4</b>
CPM	144 01-10 000000000 10000000000000000000000	0000000 7190000 719000000000000000000000	258 202000 2020000	21125 202125 202125 202125	202020	999 299 299 299 299 299
NF ADJ\$	228152 11629 18629 186152 186152 186152		91469 91469 91469 9260	27686 27686 119958 27686	00000000000000000000000000000000000000	5322
с Ц	0000000	-0000	000000	00000	00030	000
ΤYΡ	m@@ </td <td>70404</td> <td>-0-00</td> <td>イトレート</td> <td>muonu</td> <td>0</td>	70404	-0-00	イトレート	muonu	0
ADP			ດເດດ <del></del> ດາດ	າທີ່ທີ່ທີ່ທີ່ທີ່ທີ່	ມີເມີຍາເບັນ	າແກເກ
NDEX	20000000000000000000000000000000000000				00000000000000000000000000000000000000	2000 2000 2000 2000
Ħ	22222222222222222222222222222222222222		100000 100000	1054Cu	5000 C C C C C C C C C C C C C C C C C C	
START II	755.9 755.9 755.9 755.9 757.9 75	777022	20000000000000000000000000000000000000			81.2 154
COST START I	273529    75.9    55.1      20040    80.5    1433      32436    80.5    1467      32436    80.5    1467      11621    81.5    1579      173814    77.6    1142	20223 63056 777 77 77 21097 77 77 150 221097 77 71 77 7150 79 6 150	172201 800 145 177333 79 5 135 149603 79 5 135 13464 78 5 120 120 5 120 120 5 120	227715.81.51155 227715.80.51146 227715.81.51146 251065.81.5153	27842.81.5157 422899.81.0157 232029.82.0157 232029.82.0155 82.2165	97349- 81- 2 154 99960- 81- 3 154
MANDAY COST START II	3754    115229    75.9    551      2994    279459    75.9    551      750    220450    80.5    1433      722    32436    80.5    1433      693    11621    81.5    1579      4084    255638    77.6    1422      2930    173814    78.3    1220	277 20223 77 715 251 20253 78 2 120 251 20997 77 715 1473 379 20097 77 715 155	2886      70.207      80      144        1147      77333      79      5      135        354      14,9003      79      5      135        1480      13464      78      5      135        1128      57.046      79      5      125        1128      57.046      79      5      135	820. 7435. 79-5 135 308. 11472. 80-4 145 875. 34 193. 80.4 146 1813. 2277 15. 81.5 146 834. 51065. 81.1 153	1400 37842 81.5 157 369 42899 81.0 152 950 22027 80.2 143 046 23029 82 2 143	2221. 97349. 81.2 154 210. 9960. 81.3 155
ROJECT MANDAY COST START II	462.    3754.    115229.    75.9    551      502.    2994.    279459.    75.9    551      6850.    750.    279459.    75.9    551      6423.    722.    32436.    80.5    1433      6431.    693.    11621.    81.5    1579      6833.    2930.    173814.    75.6    1423      6833.    2930.    173814.    78.3    1220	6852. 1236. 63056. 78.2 115 7880. 251. 21477. 80.2 143 7883. 379. 21097. 77.7 115 7883. 379. 21097. 79.6 136	7890 2880 170207 80 2145 7891 1147 77333 79 5 135 7892 354 149003 79 5 135 8893 1128 57046 79 5 135 8893 1128 57046 79 5 135	9406 820 7435 79 5 135 9408 308 11472 80 4 145 9409 875 34 193 80 4 146 98901 834 51065 81 1 153	9902. 1400. 37842. 81.5 157 9903. 369. 42899. 81.0 152 9905. 950. 22027. 80.2 143 9581. 1046. 23029. 82.2 145	9950. 2221. 97349. 81.2 154 9955. 210. 9960. 81.3 154

G

Construction Productivity Data (cont'd.)

A D.T \$ ANOU L'ONE TVDF ADP TNDEY STA RT TO OT

DEFL ATOR	00.05542420 00.0554242420 00.055422420 00.0554224242 00.0501267382424 00.0501267382424 00.0501267382424 00.05012673824 00.05012673824 00.0501267382 00.05012675757575757575757575757575757575757575	0.977438 0.977438 0.977438 0.977438 0.977438 0.977438 0.977438	0.977438 0.977438 0.977438	0.198733 0.198733 0.825484 0.8253484 0.8253484 0.867419 0.867419 0.667789 187789 0.827487487 0.827487 0.8277487 0.877748777487 0.8777487 0.8777487 0.8777487 0.8777487 0.8777487 0.8777487 0.8777487 0.8777487 0.8777487 0.8777487 0.8777487 0.877747 0.877747 0.877747 0.877747 0.877747 0.877747 0.877747 0.877747 0.877747 0.877747 0.877747 0.877747 0.877747 0.877747 0.877747 0.877747 0.877747 0.8777747 0.877777777777777777777777777777777777	0.825365
LOC	NUNUNUNU	້າບບບບບບ	າດດຳດາດ	ດ້ທີ່ດີດດີດດີ	•••
CPM	20101026573	715.57 57.48 39.09 10.09	17.71 39.21 16.29		134.76
ONF ADJ\$		607516 4607516 7703997 879083 87983	241089 241089 63436 204382	224747 254747 259908 234747 259908	1493905
Ŭ ы	00000000000		3030	0000000	201
TYP	-0000-00-0		·	0000000	<u>, , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , </u>
ADP	າດເບັດເບັດເບັດເບັດເບັດເບັດເບັດເບັດເບັດເປັນເປັນເປັນເປັນເປັນເປັນເປັນເປັນເປັນເປັນ				·
INDEX	00000000000000000000000000000000000000	851.000 851.000 851.000 851.000 851.000 851.000	851-000 851-000 851-000	104110411041104110411041104110410411041	1007.797
START	20000000000000000000000000000000000000	24000010 NP1010100	00 E M	10100000000000000000000000000000000000	76.4
					•
CO ST	2995 2955 2955 2955 2955 2955 2955 2955	788300 76100 76100 106500	2 9 0 2 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0	1048800 11066600 3219900 110000	1810000.
MANDAY COST	15556 155526 155526 155526 1755526 17555526 17555526 1755555 1755555 1755555 1755555 1755555 1755555 1755555 1755555 1755555 1755555 1755555 1755555 1755555 1755555 1755555 1755555 1755555 1	849. 801500. 8594. 505400. 19712. 788300. na 106500.	4252.90200 6149.292100. 2862.64900.	2/24 1306 1306 106800 26420 25643 2772300 25643 321900 25643 321900 532000 532000 532000 532000	11086. 1810000.
ROJECT MANDAY COST	99980 1555 436 457 457 457 457 457 1755 292595 17556 17756 17556 17556 17556 17756 17556 17756 175566 17556 175567 17556 175566 175567 175567 175567 175567 17556	21. 849. 80 2120 21. 849. 80 21500 28594. 505400 30. 19712. 788300 42. na 106500 47. na 106500	49 4252 90200 50 6149 292100 51 2862 64900	534 2724 104800 5958 1306 106800 6253 2642 272300 6276 345 112800 6521 4123 631000	6815. 11086. 1810000.

84

Ċ,

## Construction Productivity Data (cont'd.)

DEFLATOR	000000000000000000000000000000000000000	
ບັ	ດາກໍດີດີດີດີດີດີດີດີດີດີດີດີດີດີດີດີດີດີດີ	
CPR	20012 022年101121616年の927年607818160 266年 014001121616年6022年6020001年40196 2001202020202020202020202020202020 200120202020	
ONF ADJ\$	торования торования	
ਹ ਬ	004000000000000000000000000000000000000	
d X T.	100m@0wwwm@000130@100NNN@Nmm	
ADP	ົ້າບໍ່ກໍ່ດີບໍ່ດີບໍ່ດີບໍ່ດີບໍ່ດີບໍ່ດີບໍ່ດີບໍ່ດີບ	
TNDEX	00000000000000000000000000000000000000	
START	~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~	
COST	62 64 65 65 65 65 65 65 65 65 65 65	
MANDAY	100048 5000040000000000000000000000000000	
ROJECT		

### <u>APPENDIX B</u> TABULATIONS RELATING TO PEELIMINARY CPM ANALYSIS

### TABLE 7

Cross-tabulation of Initial Puerto Rico Projects

COUN ROW P COL P TOT P	T I CT I CT I	NO ADP 1 I	ADP 25-75% ADP 3 1	100% ADP 5 I	ROW TOTAL
STANDARD BUILDING		$\begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$		9 I 52.9 I 42.9 I 19.6 I	17 37.0
BUILDING W/ MINIMUM FINIS UTILITIES	2 I H, I 	80.0 I 33.3 I 17.4 I		20.0 9.5 4.3	10 21.7
BUILDING W/ GREATER FINIS OR UTILITIES	3 I H, I I	100.0 I 4.2 I 2.2 I		0.0 0.0 0.0 0.0	2.2
PAVING	5 I I I I	25.0 I 8.3 I 4.3 I	12.5 100.0 2.2	62.5 H 23.8 H 10.9 H	17.4
PIER WORK				100.0 4.3 2.2	2.2
OTHER	9	55.6 I 20.8 I 10.9 I		44.4 19.0 8.7	9 19.6
COLUM TOTA		24 52.2	2.2	45.7 <sup>21</sup>	46 100.0

Cross-tabulation of Initial Projects at Rota, Spain

ROW TOTAL	21.8	16.4	14 • 5	7.3	10.6	
нн 1	- - -	┥┝┥┝┥┝┥┝┥┝ ┃	┥┝┥┝┥┍┥┝┥┡ ╏	╡┝╼╡╞╼╡╞╼╡┝ ╵	<b>аннын</b> ы 	1
100% ADP 5	58 12.3 12.3	88 21-6 14-5		100-4 10-8 7-3	0000 0000 0000	
<b>1</b> 11	Чыңыңы	┥┝┥┝┥┝┥┝┙┝┙┝╸┆	┥┝┥┝┥┝┥┝	┥┝┥┢┥┢┥┢ ╿	┥╆┥┍┥┝┥┝┥┝ ╹	
25-75 ADP 3	108.3 100.0	0000	0000	0000	0000	
нн	ананан	┥┝┥┝┥┝┥┝	┥┝┥┝┥┝┥┝	┥┝╌╡┝╌┥╞╾╡╞╌┥┝	┥┝┥┝┥┝┥┝┥┝┥ ╏	1
0-25% ADP 2	258.3 1.8 1.8	0000	12.5 12.5 1.8	0000	0000	
ᆈ	┃ ┥┝┥┝┥┝┥┝┥╞┥┢	┃ ┥┝┥┝┥┝┥┝┥┝ ╹	┥┝┥┝┥┝┥┝	╸ ┥┝┥┝┥┝┥┝┥┝┥ ╽	╷ ┥┍┥┝┥┝┥┝┥ ╹	
NO AD	235 235 239 239 239 239 239 239 239 239 239 239	11.11	50 0 30 8 7 3	0000	16.7	
нннн	╏ ┩┠┥┝┥┡┥╞┥╸	<b>і</b> 	i -HHHHH	┇ ┥┡╅┠┥╞┥┠┥╿┥╿		
COUNT ROW PCT COL PCT TOT PCT	TTPE 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1	BUILDING W/ 2 MINIMUN PINISH, UTILITES	BUILDING W/ 3 GFEATER FINISH, OR UTILITIES	ELECTRICAL DISTRIBUTION SYSTEM	PAVING 5	

87

ħ

1

Cross-tabulation of Initial Projects, at Rota, Spain (cont'd.)

211

ROW TOTAL	1.8	3 <b>.</b> 6	7.3	16.4	100 <b>.</b> 0
HF	┥┝┥┝┥┝┥┝┥┝ ╿	┥┝┥┝┥╞┥┏┪┝ Ì	╡┝┥┝┥┝┥┝┥┝	┥┝┥┝┥┝┥┝┥┝	
100% ADP 5	100.0 2.7 1.8	100 300 4400 64	25.0 2.7 1.8	66.7 16.2 10.9	37 67 <u>-</u> 37
b≰ I	, анананан 1	┥┝┥┝┥┝┥┝┥┝	a⊷a⊷a⊷a⊷a I	ананыны	, ⊣ }
25-75 ADP 3	0000	0000	0000	0000	- 8 - 8
нн	┥┝┥┝┥┝┥┝┥	ныныны	нынын	чынын	4
0-25% ADP 2	0000	0000	0000	50.02 3.60 3.60	7.3
Нн	, 	┥┝┥┝┥┝┥┝┥┝	анарар	-	-1
NO ADI	0000	0000	75.0 23.1 5.5	11.1 7.7 1.8	13 23.6
нннн	┥┝┥┝┥┝┥┝┥	╡ ┥┝┥┝┥┝┥┝┥┝	ныныны	┥┝┥┝┥┝┥╞	4
COUNT ROW PCT COL PCT COL PCT	AIRFIELD 6	PIER WORK 7	MECHANICAL DISTRIBUTION SYSTEM	9 OTHER	COLUMN

88

ł

Ċ

Cross-tabulation of Initial Projects, at Diego Garcia

٩

R OW TOTAL	24.02	16 <b>.</b> 0	20.0	2.0	
۲	⊣⊦न⊢न⊢न⊢न⊧⊣⊬ I	┥┝┥┝┥┝┥┝┥┝ ╵	┫┣┥┡┥┡┥┡┥┡ ╵	┥┝┥┝┥┝┥┝┥┝ ╵	-
1007 ADF	58.3 21.9 14.0	75-0 18-8 12-0	60-06 12-0	100 2.0	
٠	ныныны 1	┥┡┥┡┥┡┥┡┥┝ ╎	┥┡┥┡┥┡┥┡┥┡ ╵	┥╄┥┝┥┝┥┝┥┝ ╿	-
75-99% ADP	0000	0000	100-0 2-0	0000	
۲	ніннын		нынын	┥┝┥┝┥┝┥┝┥	i.
25-75% ADP	16.7 66.7 4.0	0000	0000	0000	
F	-ң-н-ң-	анынын	нннн	нннн	-
ADP NO ADP	25.0 21.4 6.0	25 14 14 0 30 25	21-6 21-6 6.6	0000	
┝┥┝┥┝┥┝	-1-1-1-1-1-1-1-1-1-1-1-1-1-1-1-1-1-1-1	┶┝┥┝┥┝┥┝┥┝ ╵	┥┍┥╒┥┝┥┝┥┝	┥┝┥┝┥┢┥┢┥	-1 
COUNT COU PCT COL PCT	TYPE 101 FUL STANDARD BUILDING	BUILDING W/ 2 MININUM FINISH, UTILITIES	BUILDING W/ GREATER FINISH, OR UTILITIES	ELECTRICAL DISTRIBUTION SYSTEM	

Cross-tabulation of Initial Projects at Diego Garcia (cont'd.) Table 9

1

Ĉ

	row ToTAL	4.0	2.0	10.5	22.0	100.0
		<mark>┥┝┥┝┥┝┥┝┥</mark> ┝	┥┝┥┝┥┝┥┝	╺┥╞╼┥╞╼┥╞╼┥╞ ┨	┥┝┥┝┥┝┥┝┥┝ I	
	100% ADP 5	50 230.0 230.0	0000	100 100 100 06 05	54 54 12.0 12.0	32 64 <b>.</b> 0
	HH	╸ ╸┝╸┥┝╸┥┝╸┥┝╸ ╹	╵ ┥┝╾╣┢╼┥┢╼┥┝╌┥┡ ╵	┥┝┥╞┥┝┥┝┥	┙ ┥┝┥┝┥┝┥┝┥┝ ╿	, , ,
	75-99% ADP	0000	0000	0000	0000	2.0
	нн	 	│ ┥┝┥┝┥┝┥┝ ╵	┃ ┥┝┥┝┥╞┥╞┥╞┥╞ ╹	 	  -  
	25-75% ADP 3	0000	0000	0000	2.0 33.0 33.0 33.0	6. 0
	H	╻ ┥┝┥┝┥┝┥┍	ЧННН	ныныны	ныныны	    
DP	NO ADP	50-01 2-0	100.0	0000	0 88 88 98 88 88 88 88 88 88 88 88 88 88	14 28.0
٩,		┥┝╼╽┝ <del>╡</del> ┝╼╏┝┥╞╸	┥┝╼┥┝╼┥┝╼┥┍	╡ ┥┝┥┝┥┢┥┝┥┝	╡┝┥┝┥╞┥╞┥┝	  -
	COUNT ROL PCT COL PCT	PAVING 5	AIRFIELD 6	MECHANICAL DISTRIBUTION SYSTEM	OTHER 9	COLUAN
	2	H				

90

ľ

**Cross-tabulation of Final Projects at Puerto Rico** 

51.15	14 48.3	100.0
-1  1  1  1  1  1  1	-1 p-1 p-1 t-1 t-1 t-1 t-1 t-1 t-1 t-1 t-1 t-1 t	4
20000 20000 20000	28 28 136 138 138	20.7
┥┝┥┝┥┝┥┝┥┝ ╿		-4 1
106-7	0000	н т т
┥┝┥┝┥┝┥┝ ╿	ананана Г	4
46.7 77.8 24.1	22-30 22-30 23-40 23-40 23-40 23-40 23-40 24-40-40 24-40-40 24-400	3 <b>1.</b> 0
┥┝┥┝┥┝┥┝┥ ╿	al-teleteleteleteleteleteleteleteletelete	1
333 38 17 25 5 7	57.18 61.5 27.6	13
╸ ┙┝┥┝┥┝┥┝┥	┥╆┥┝┥┝┥┝┥┝	i ⊣
-	ۍ ۲	COLUMN TOTAL
ADF NO ADF	100% ADP	_
	NO ADF 1 I 33.5 I 46.7 I 1 2 2 1 15.15 I 38.5 I 77.8 I 100.0 I 33.3 I 51.7 I 17.2 I 24.1 I 3.4 I 6.9 I	ADF    1    1    33.5    1    46.7    1    1    2    1    51.15      NO ADF    1    33.5    1    46.7    1    106.0    1    13.3    1    51.15      1    17.2    1    77.8    1    106.0    1    33.3    1    51.15      1    17.2    1    24.1    1    33.4    1    6.9    1    51.3      1    17.2    1    24.1    1    33.4    1    6.9    1    48.3      100%    ADP    5    1    22.2    1    0.0    1    56.7    1    48.3      100%    ADP    1    27.6    1    66.9    1    48.3

91

: Į

•

# Cross-tabulation of Final Projects at Rota, Spain

	COUNT ROW PCT COL PCT TOT PCT	IYPE I ISTANDAR I BLDG. I	D MINIGW/ FINISH	BLDG W/ SFINISH, UTILLTY,	PAVING I 5	MECH. DISTRIBU SYSTEM I	LION ROW L TOTA
NO ADP	-	лора 1000 100 100 100 100 100 100 100 100 1	69 11 11 11	100 60 60 10 11 11	16.1 16.1	н 11 75-0 9-7	11 35 <b>.5</b>
100% App	്ഗ	Н Н 35.0 70.0 22.6	-1000 1032 1932	0000 400 40 41	125 83.30 16.13	иннн 2 200-1 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2	64-50
	COLUMN TOTAL	10 32.3	19-4	16.1	19.4	12.9	100 <u>-</u> 0

92

٦

:

TABLE 12 Cross-tabulation of Final Projects at Diego Garcia

ľ

I ON ROH TOTAL	20.8	79.2	100.00
MECH. DISTRIBUT SYSTEM B I		100.00 HI 100.00 HI 12.55 HI	12.5
PAVING 5 <u>i</u>	1000-01 40-01		t - 2
BLDG W/ >FINISH UTLITY 1	44444 50007 475 -75	31-66 31-66 25-7	29.2
BIDG W/ BING W/ FINISH 22 I	нн н 50-0 50-0 7-1 7-1 7-1 7-1 7-1 7-1 7-1 7-1 7-1 7-1	11111 80.0 16.1 16.1 16.1	20.8
IYPE STANDARD BLDG, J J	ннн 52-00 8-00 8-00 8-00 1-00 1-00 1-00 1-00 1	31.66 H 25.00 H	33. 38 33. 38
COUNT I ROU PCT IS COL PCT IS TOT PCT I		יארא ו ס	COLUMN TOTAL
ć	UF NO ADP	100% ADP	

93

۰.

A CONTRACT OF A CONTRACT OF

2

84 CPM Values by Type, ADP, Location Breakdown of

	N	84	6-18-12-20 5-28-12-20 7-0-12-00-10-10-10-10-10-10-10-10-10-10-10-10-	800 <b>0</b> 5003	000-0-000 0
•	STD DEV	31.0040	225 255 255 255 255 255 255 255 255 255	11.9684 12.0064 0.0 12.3707 8.7540 11.1488	17.8954 18.3013 0.0 10.1185 18.90 18.00 20.3110
•	<b>HEA N</b>	29.2895	20.1500 324.1500 324.1500 10.26333 10.26333 17.9476 15.6200 15.6200 15.0000 15.0000 15.0000 15.0000 15.0000 15.0000 15.0000 15.0000 15.0000 15.0000 15.0000 15.0000 15.00000 15.00000 15.0000000000	233. 1900 2335. 0900 2595. 53000 2595. 53000 255. 555. 555. 555. 555. 555. 555. 555.	288.248 288.246 288.246 288.0100 2878.46800 2578.46800000000000000000000000000000000000
	VALUE LABEI	CN	STANDARD BIDG. NO ADP PUERTO RICC ROTA SPAIN DIEGO GARCIA 100% ADP PUERTO RICC ROTA SPAIN DIEGO GARCIA	BLDG MIN. FINISH NO ADP PUERTO RICC ROTA SPAIN DIEGO GARCIA 100% ADP PUERTO RICC ROTA SPAIN DIEGO GARCIA	BLDG>FINISE-UTILITY NO ADP PUERTO RICC ROTA SPAIN DIEGO GARCIA 100% ADP ROTA SPAIN CIEGO GARCIA
	CODE	POPULATI	๛๛๛๛๛๛๛๛๛๛๛๛๛๛๛๛๛๛๛๛๛๛๛๛๛๛๛๛๛๛๛๛๛๛๛๛๛๛๛	๛๛๛๛๛๛๛๛	എ <del>ം - ഗ</del> യനഗപ
	VARIABLE	FOR ENTIRE	TYPE ADP LCC LOC ADP LOC LOC LOC	TYPE ADP LOC LOC ADP LOC LOC LOC	TYPE ADP LOC ADP LOC ADP LOC LOC

94

5.4

- |

.

Breakdown of 84 CPE Values By TYPE, ADP, LOCATION (cont'd.)

N.S.

VARIABLE	CODE	VALUE LABEI	YEAN	STD DEV	N
TYPE ADP LOC ALP LOC LOC LOC	๛๛๛๛๛๛๛	FAVING NO ADP PUERTO RICC ROTA SPAIN DIEGO GARCIA 100% ADP FUERTO RICC FOTA, SPAIN	66 955500 955500 955500 955500 955500 955500 955500 955500 955500 955500 955500 955500 955500 955500 9555000 9555000 9555000000 955500000000	63.4212 166.75172 0.000 33.92684 91.8509	040040 040040
TYPE ADP ADP LOC LCC	ພ <del>⊷</del> ∂ທΩ⇔	MECH.DIST.SYS. NO ADP ROTA,SPAIN 100% ADP ROTA,SPAIN LIEGO GARCIA	002000 002000 00000 00000 0000 00000 00000 00000 0000	21.7514 31.2807 6.7332 7.5427	►₩₩4 <b>−</b> ₩

95

٩,

١

\*\*\*\*\*

:



 

 1.0
 1.0
 1.5
 1.2.8
 1.2.5

 1.1
 1.1
 1.2
 1.2
 1.2

 1.1
 1.1
 1.8
 1.8

MICROCOPY RESOLUTION TEST CHART NATIONAL BUREAU OF STANDARDS-1963-A

### APPENDIX\_C PERCENT DIRECT LABOR DATA

### TABLE 14

### Case Identification for Percent Direct Labor

BTNCCD	E Mainbody Site	Battalior	From	To	
215 2236 2345 257 267 285 285	Rota, Spain	5 133 40 1 62 74 5	Nov 76 Jul 77 Mar 78 Jul 79 Mar 80 Nov 80 Jul 81	Jul 77 Mar 78 Nov 78 Jul 79 Mar 80 Jul 81 Mar 82	
51227 5237 45536 555555 55555555555555555555555555	Diego Garcia	133 74 132 130 45 130 45 130 45 130 62	Jun 76 Mar 77 Jul 78 Mar 79 Nov 79 Jul 80 Jul 81 Oct 81	Feb 77 Nov 77 Jul 78 Mar 79 Jul 80 Mar 81 Nov 81 Jul 82	
111 124 1353 1561 1612 187	Puerto Rico	1 4 5 133 40 1 62 74	Jul 76 Apr 77 Jan 78 Sep 78 Jan 30 Sep 80 May 81	Apr 77 Jan 78 Sep 78 Jan 80 Jan 80 May 81 Jan 82	
416 4227 4553 45536	Guam	40 62 74 133 40	Jan 77 Oct 77 May 78 Jan 79 Sep 79 May 80 Jan 31 Sep 81	Oct 77 May 78 Jah 79 Sep 79 May 80 Jah 81 Sep 81 Apr 82	
317 3298 334898 3567889 3789 3789 3789 3789 3789 3789 3789	Okinawa, Japan	740000000	Sep 76 Apr 77 Jul 77 Mar 78 Jun 78 Jun 79 Jan 80 Aug 81	Apr 77 Oct 77 Mar 78 Jun 79 Jan 80 Aug 80 Mar 81	

-----

Percent Direct Labor Data

CASE	BINCODE	DLPERS	MBEN	%lostday	MBACTDL
17177777777777777777777777777777777777	2222222222555555555555111111111144444444	14 09 0000 000 00 000 800000 000000 14 09 0000 000 00 000 800000 00000 14 14 09 0000 000 00 000 00000 000000 14 14 09 0000 000 000 00000 000000 14 14 09 0000 000 000 000000 000000 14 14 09 0000 000 000 000000 0000000 14 14 09 0000 000 000 000000 0000000 14 14 09 0000 000 000 000000 0000000 14 14 09 0000 000 000 00000 00000000000 14 14 09 0000 000 000 000000 00000000000	443 3454455 a7967595350743858041205476670 1500 a811354455 a7967595350743858041205476670 343360934455 a953258296530946280239875670	na 5 3.1 na 000 3.5 na 000 na 000 n na 000 n na 000 n na 000 n n0 n n	67 804000 00 00002100587003010413000000000000000000000000000000
42	377.	na	1//•	0.0	22.0

Table 15 Percent Lirect Labor Data (cont'd.)

DANG BANNA INANA RAS

98

total 150 150 150 150 562 13---other 00000000 35 S --Non-Occupational Field Construction Battalion (Non-Mobilization) 00-455 20 h m 00----8 ц 00--000 ω Υn 00---UW4 Š 16 MOPONOTO United States Kaval Mobile Manpover Authorization ea 14 13-ce **#22**0 1770/10 50 Field ut ==m 47 -Occupational ЯS 25 46 0--m-ດວວດດ ສະເທາງຜາ nq 157 らうり 5 57 ; 08882 50997 92 00 total eeeee 1 1 3

-1

Figure C.1 NMCB Peacetime Manning Allovance.

-1.

99

٠. .

### LIST OF REFERENCES

- 1. Civil Engineering Support Office, <u>Automated Data</u> <u>System Development Plan for NMCB/MIS</u>, Port Hueneme, CA, February 1984
- "Computer Vanguard", <u>Engineering News Record</u>, pp. 11-12, 1 July 1982.
- 3. CFNAVINST 5450.46G, <u>United States Naval Mobile</u> <u>Construction Eattalions</u> <u>Doctrine</u> and <u>Policy</u> <u>Governing</u>, 4 December 1975.
- 4. OPNAV 1000/2, Manpower Authorization, 15 May 1982
- 5. "Construction Scoreboard", <u>Engineering News Record</u>, 8 April 1976.
- 6. "The ENR 400", Engineering News Record, 15 April 1976.
- 7. Kellogg, J. C., Howell, G. E., and Taylor, D. C., "Hierarchy Model of Construction Productivity", Journal of the Construction Division, American Society of Civil Engineers, pp. 137, March 1981.
- 8. Choromokos, J. Jr. and EcLee, K. E., "Construction Productivity Improvement Survey", <u>Construction</u> <u>Productivity Frontiers</u>, pr. 1, IIT Center, Chicago, Illinois, January 1980.
- 9. Rees, A., "Improving Concepts and Techniques for Productivity Measurements", <u>Monthly Labor Review</u>, pp. 23-27, September 1979.
- 10. Kendrick, J. W., <u>Understanding Productivity</u>, Jchn Hopkins University Press, 1971.
- 11. <u>Measurement</u> and <u>Interpretation</u> of <u>Productivity</u>, National Research Council, <u>National</u> Academy of Sciences, 1979.
- 12. Nelson, R. R., "Research on Productivity Growth and Productivity Differences: Dead Ends and New Departures", Journal of Economic Literature, v. XIX, September 1981.
- 13. Bortz, S. A., Editorial, <u>Construction Productivity</u> <u>Frontiers</u>, pp. i, IIT Center, Chicago, Illinois, October 1980.

14.	Dossantos, W. A., <u>NCF Readiness Training</u> , <u>Peacetime</u> <u>Construction</u> and the <u>Wai</u> <u>Mission</u> : <u>A Question of</u> <u>Congruency</u> , M. S. Thesis, <u>Naval</u> Postgraduate School, <u>Monterey</u> , California, September 1983.
15.	"Construction Scoreboard", <u>Engineering News_Record</u> , pp. 24, 9 January 1975.
16.	"Construction Scoreboard", <u>Engineering News_Record</u> , pp. 30, 8 January 1976.
17.	"Construction Scoreboard", <u>Engineering News Record</u> , pp. 22, 6 January 1977.
18.	"Construction Scoreboard", <u>Engineering News Record</u> , pp. 25, 12 January 1978.
19.	"Construction Scoreboard", <u>Engineering News Record</u> , pp. 31, 4 January 1979.
20.	"ENR Market Trends", <u>Engineering News Record</u> , pp. 36, 10 January 1980.
21.	"ENR Market Trends", <u>Engineering News Record</u> , pp. 44, 8 January 1981.
22.	"ENR Market Trends", <u>Engineering News Record</u> , pp. 44, 7 January 1982.
23.	Wonnacott, T. H., and Wonnacott, R. J., <u>Introductory</u> <u>Statistics</u> , 3rd ed., pp. 241-254, Wiley, 1977.
24.	Turban, E., and Meredith, J. R., <u>Fundamentals of</u> <u>Management Science</u> , rev. ed., pp. 36, Business Fublications, Inc., 1981.
25.	COMCBLANTINST 5312.1, Drited States Atlantic Fleet Naval Construction Force Timekeeping: procedures for, 13 June 1979.
26.	Anthony, R. N., and Herzlinger, R. E., <u>Management</u> <u>Control in Nonflofit Organizations</u> , pp. 250, Irwin, 1980.
27.	COMCBPAC/LANTINST 3121.1, <u>Deployment Completion</u> <u>Reforts for Facific and Atlantic Naval Mobile</u> <u>Construction Battalions: procedures for submittal of</u> , 21 September 1977.
28.	NavPers 15909C, <u>Enlisted Transfer Manual</u> , U. S. Naval Military Personnel Command, Washington, D.C.

### INITIAL DISTRIBUTION LIST

K.

7

		No.	Copies
1.	Defense Technical Information Center Cameron Station Alexandria, Virginia 22314		2
2.	Library, Code 0142 Naval Postgraduate School Monterey, California 93943		2
3.	Civil Engineer Ccrps Officers School Port Hueneme, California 93043		1
4.	Civil Engineer Support Office Naval Construction Battalicn Center Port Hueneme, California 93043		1
5.	Ccmmander Naval Facilities Engineering Command 200 Stovall Street Alexandria, Virginia 22332		1
6-	Ccmmander Naval Constructicn Battalions U. S. Pacific Fleet Makalapa Hi Fearl Harbor, Hawaii 9686C		1
7.	Commander Naval Construction Battalions U. S. Atlantic Fleet Naval Amphibious Base Little Creek Norfolk, Virginia 23521		1
8.	Ccmmanding Officer Navy Public Works Center (ICDR G.R. Wegener PO Box 24003 Oakland, California 94623	)	3
9.	Frof. D. Boger, Code 54DB Department of Administrative Science Naval Postgraduate School Monterey, California 93943		1
10.	Prof. K. Euske, Code 54KE Department of Administrative Science Naval Postgraduate School Monterey, California 93943		1



## FILMED

7-85

### DTIC